VOL. X. (No. 3) JANUARY, 1913 No. 39

AUM

THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY

PUBLISHED BY
THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
NEW YORK, U.S.A.

The Theosophical Quarterly.

Published by The Theosophical Society at
159 Warren Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

In Europe single numbers may be obtained from and subscriptions sent to
Dr. Archibald Keightley, 46 Brook Street, London, W., England.

Price for non-members, $1.00 per annum; single copies, 25 cents.

CONTENTS OF VOL. X., No. 3.

PAGE

NOTES AND COMMENTS 193
FRAGMENTS 203
EARLY ENGLISH MYSTICS 204
SHANKARACHARYA'S CATECHISM 214
TWO LETTERS 221
THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS 229
THE MYSTERY OF ALL TIME 250
WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY..... 253
WHY I DO NOT JOIN THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY 255
THE PRACTICE OF THE PRESENCE OF GOD..... 261
ON THE SCREEN OF TIME 265
THE NEW TREND IN SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY.... 274
REVIEWS 279
Christian Dogmatics; The Revolutions of Civilization.
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 284
What is the Theosophical Teaching About Christ? Have the Masters Minds? Theosophy and the Book of Genesis; Women's Suffrage. Is Hypnotism or Suggestion Ever Lawful? Can We Help the Dead?

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

The principal aim and object of this Society is to form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color. The subsidiary objects are: The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and the investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

Entered July 17, 1903, at Brooklyn, N. Y., as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Copyright, 1912, by The Theosophical Society.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
JAN 6 1913
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

JANUARY 1913

The Theosophical Society, as such, is not responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

The Western Avatar

DR. BOYD CARPENTER, one of the foremost divines of the Church of England, said, the other day, that a noteworthy factor of the intellectual life of our times is the influence of Oriental thought upon the West, and especially upon the Western understanding of Christianity. The West has need of the East, and will be influenced by the East, just as the East has need of the West, and will receive a permanent impress from the thought and life of the West. The distinguished churchman went on to say that the East is preeminently religious; that throughout Asia there is no such thing as an atheist, one who recognizes no divine principle; and he described a congress in India at which the adherents of many faiths, Oriental and Occidental, joined in singing John Henry Newman's hymn "Lead Kindly Light," each one accepting the symbol as an expression of his own religion, his own conception of the Divinity.

We find ourselves in hearty sympathy with this trend of thought, which we venture to call eminently Theosophical; and we are convinced that not only is Oriental thought destined to revolutionize many of our Western concepts, but that it has profoundly modified them already, and in no region, perhaps, more profoundly than in that suggested by Dr. Boyd Carpenter himself, our understanding of Christianity. It is without doubt the fact that many of the mysteries in the Christian teaching, many things which have been stumblingblocks, almost heartbreaks, to thousands of devout and earnest Christians, find quite simple solutions through the clews of Oriental thought, so much deeper, so much more philosophical, than the current thought of the West or the traditional interpretation of the Schools.

This is particularly true of the mysteries which enshroud the person of the Founder of Christianity, and perhaps most true of that body of thought which is concerned with the reconciliation of his divinity and his humanity, which declares him to be at once "perfect God and perfect man." Our Western thought supplies us with no ideas or processes of thought which enable us to give a real intellectual assent to such a dogma. We may accept it or we may reject it. It is doubtful whether, in either event, we understand it. And this dogma is not an isolated idea, which one may accept or reject without detriment to the wholeness of one's view; it is rather fundamental to a right understanding of the whole life which, opening in the Nativity, found its climax in the Crucifixion and Resurrection. And it is fundamental, because it is the expression of a profound law, a profound reality in spiritual life.

The thought of the West has hardly any processes by which this mystery can even be approached. Oriental philosophy, on the contrary, can go far toward making it understandable, giving it a real content of connected and luminous thought, showing its place in the whole philosophy of spiritual being. It seems to us that we shall be well advised if we try to illustrate this; well advised, also, if we try to do so along the lines laid down by a distinguished thinker, who was saturated with Oriental thought, one who represents a venerable and profoundly valuable line of Oriental tradition: Mme. H. P. Blavatsky. In the works of this woman of genius and learning, it happens that there is very much which bears directly on our problem, and much that is singularly illuminating and inspiring.

Let us begin with *Isis Unveiled,* which, published in 1877, was the first considerable work of Mme. Blavatsky. In *Isis Unveiled,* there is already much concerning the life and teaching of Jesus, and what Mme. Blavatsky has to say falls clearly under two heads: the first, and much less vital, is controversial, directed against current dogmatic and popular misconceptions, directed to the removing of obstacles in the way of a right understanding of the life and work of the Western Avatar. This, let it be understood, is the title given to Jesus by Mme. Blavatsky, who writes in *Isis* (ii, 566), "Then again: 'Christ glorified not himself to *be made High Priest;* but He that said unto him: Thou art my son; to-day have I begotten thee' (Heb. v. 5). This is a very clear inference, that, 1, Jesus was considered only in the light of a high priest, like Melchisedek—another *avatar,* or incarnation of Christ, according to the Fathers; and, 2, that the writer thought that Jesus had become a 'Son of God' only at the moment of his initiation by water; hence, that he was not born a god, neither was he begotten physically by Him. Every initiate of the 'last hour' became, by the very fact of his initiation, a son of God."

This passage illustrates the two elements in *Isis:* a determined undermining of crystallized dogma and misunderstanding, and, on the other hand, much more positive and vital, a deeply philosophical and constructive view of the life and character of Jesus. We shall quote chiefly from the latter class of passages, the positive and constructive. To this class belongs the following (ii, 132): "The Nazarene reformer had undoubtedly belonged to one of these sects [Essenes or Nazars]; though, perhaps, it would be next to impossible to decide absolutely which. But what is self-evident is that he preached the philosophy of Buddha-Sakyamuni. Denounced by the later prophets, cursed by the Sanhedrim, the nazars were secretly if not openly persecuted by the orthodox synagogue. It becomes clear why Jesus was treated with such contempt from the first, and deprecatingly called 'the Galilean.' Nathaniel inquires—'Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?' (*John* i, 46) at the very beginning of his career; and merely because he knows him to be a *nazar*. Does not this clearly hint, that even the older nazars were not really Hebrew religionists, but rather a class of Chaldean theurgists? . . . The motive of Jesus was evidently like that of Gautama-Buddha, to benefit humanity at large by producing a religious reform which should give it a religion of pure ethics; the true knowledge of God and nature having remained until then solely in the hands of the esoteric sects, and their adepts."

Concerning the "miracles" of Jesus, Mme. Blavatsky writes this in *Isis* (i, 356): "These dæmons seek to introduce themselves into the bodies of the simple-minded and idiots, and remain there until dislodged therefrom by a powerful and *pure* will. Jesus, Apollonius, and some of the apostles, had the power to cast out *devils,* by purifying the atmosphere *within* and *without* the patient, so as to force the unwelcome tenant to flight." And again (ii, 148): "But Justin Martyr states on better authority that the men of his time *who were not Jews* asserted that the miracles of Jesus were performed by magical art, the very expression used by the skeptics of those days to designate the feats of thaumaturgy accomplished in the Pagan temples. 'They even ventured to call him a magician and a deceiver of the people,' complains the martyr. In the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (the *Acta Pilati*), the Jews bring the same accusation before Pilate. 'Did we not tell thee he was a magician?' Celsus speaks of the same charge, and as a Neo-Platonist believes in it. The Talmudic literature is full of the most minute particulars, and their greatest accusation is that 'Jesus could fly as easily in the air as others could walk.' St. Austin asserted that it was generally believed that he had been initiated in Egypt, and that he wrote books concerning magic, which he delivered to John. There was a work called *Magia Jesu Christi,* which was attributed to Jesus himself. In the *Clementine Recognitions* the charge is brought against Jesus that he did

not perform his miracles as a Jewish prophet, but as a magician, *i. e.,* an initiate of the 'heathen' temples."

These are the chief passages concerning the Western Avatar in *Isis Unveiled.* Let us now turn to *The Secret Doctrine,* which was published ten or eleven years later, at the close of the year 1888. In this later and more mature work, there are many passages referring to Jesus, and it is significant that we find far fewer of the negative class which we have described—those directed against dogmatic obstacles and misconceptions—while there is more detail and elucidation on the positive side. These passages are far too numerous and voluminous for us to quote them all, but we shall try to select those which are most vital and significant.

Beginning with the passages referring to Jesus in the first volume of the *Secret Doctrine* (Edition of 1888, i, 73): "They all made a difference between the good and the bad Serpent (the Astral Light of the Kabalists) between the former, the embodiment of divine Wisdom in the region of the spiritual, and the latter, Evil, on the plane of matter. Jesus accepted the serpent as a synonym of Wisdom, and this formed part of his teaching: 'Be ye wise as serpents,' he says." Again (i, 280): " 'When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are . . . but enter into *thine inner chamber and having shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret.*' Our Father is *within us* 'in Secret,' our seventh principle, in the 'inner chamber' of our Soul perception. 'The Kingdom of Heaven' and of God *'is within us,'* says Jesus, not *outside.*" Writing of the Great Pyramid (i, 318) Mme. Blavatsky says: "Had Mr. Staniland Wake been a Theosophist he might have added that the narrow upward passage leading to the King's chamber had a 'narrow gate' indeed; the same 'strait gate' which 'leadeth unto life,' or the new spiritual re-birth alluded to by Jesus."

Speaking of the seven rays of the Logos, and of the spiritual bond which forever unites souls belonging to the same ray, Mme. Blavatsky says (i, 574): "This was known to every high Initiate in every age and in every country: 'I and my Father are one,' said Jesus (John x, 30). When He is made to say, elsewhere (xx, 17): 'I ascend to *my* Father and your Father,' it meant what has just been stated. It was simply to show that the group of His disciples and followers attracted to Him belonged to the same Dhyani Buddha, 'Star,' or 'Father,' again of the same planetary realm and division as He did." To this we may add, from a long passage (i, 577): "Jesus *the initiate* was not of pure Jewish blood, and thus recognized no Jehovah; nor did he worship any planetary god beside his own 'Father,' whom he knew, and with whom he communed as every high initiate does, 'Spirit to Spirit and Soul to Soul."

The foregoing are the chief passages referring to Jesus in the first volume of the *Secret Doctrine*. Let us now turn to the second volume. Speaking of the teaching of Reincarnation, Mme. Blavatsky writes (ii, 111): "'They descend from the pure air to be *chained to bodies*,' says Josephus repeating the belief of the Essenes. 'The air is full of Souls,' states Philo, *'they descend to be tied to mortal bodies, being desirous to live in them.'* Which shows that the Essenes believed in re-birth and many re-incarnations on earth, as Jesus himself did, a fact we can prove from the New Testament itself." Mme. Blavatsky reverts to this later, as we shall see. Commenting on a well-known passage in *Luke*, Mme. Blavatsky writes (ii, 231): "When Jesus remarks to this that he has 'beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven,' it is a mere statement of his clairvoyant powers, notifying them that he already knew it, and a reference to the incarnation of the divine ray (the gods or angels) which *falls into generation*. For not all men, by any means, benefit by that incarnation, and with some the power remains latent and dead during the whole life. Truly 'No man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son' as added by Jesus then and there. The Initiates alone understood the secret meaning of the term 'Father and the Son,' and knew that it referred to Spirit and Soul on the Earth. For the teachings of Christ were *occult* teachings, which could only be explained *at the initiation*. They were never intended for the masses, for Jesus forbade the twelve to go to the Gentiles and the Samaritans, and repeated to his disciples that the 'mysteries of Heaven' were for them alone, not for the multitudes."

Commenting on the mystery of baptism, Mme. Blavatsky says (ii, 566): "'I baptize you with water, but . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire,' says John of Jesus (Matt. iii, 2); meaning this esoterically. The real significance of this statement is very profound. It means that he, John, a non-initiated ascetic, can impart to his disciples no greater wisdom than the mysteries connected with the plane of matter (water being a symbol of it). His *gnosis* was that of exoteric and ritualistic dogma, of the dead-letter orthodoxy; while the wisdom which Jesus, an Initiate of the higher mysteries, would reveal to them, was of a higher character, for it was the 'Fire' Wisdom of the true gnosis or the *real spiritual* enlightenment."

There remains a very remarkable passage, dealing with the mystery of the Resurrection (ii, 580): "The five words of Brahma have become with the Gnostics the 'Five Words' written upon the akasic (shining) garment of Jesus at his glorification: the words translated by the Orientalists 'the robe, the glorious robe of my strength.' These words were, in their turn, the anagrammatic blind of the five mystic powers represented on the robe of the 'resurrected' Initiate after his last trial of

three days' trance; the five becoming *seven* only after his *death,* when the Adept became the full Christos, the full Krishna-Vishnu, *i. e.,* merged in Nirvana." This quotation practically completes the list of the most significant passages in *The Secret Doctrine* as published by Mme. Blavatsky herself, referring to the Western Avatar.

The essential principles were already laid down in *Isis Unveiled,* as early as 1876 or 1877, a year or two after The Theosophical Society was founded. But as time gradually made it possible, Mme. Blavatsky spoke more clearly, revealing more of the life and teaching of the Western Avatar, and dwelling more fully on details. This became possible as the old crystallized misinterpretations gradually fell away, leaving the field clear for constructive and affirmative work. During her life-time, Mme. Blavatsky thus published much concerning the life and personality of Jesus. She wrote much more, which she left among those papers she destined for publication after her death, and which were so published. From these, we are able to gather much that is of the highest value, and most illuminating, concerning the Western Avatar, and, though we cannot quote everything thus written, we have space for very much, for all, indeed, that is of primary value.

Of the birth of the Western Avatar, Mme. Blavatsky speaks thus: "Six centuries after the translation of the human Buddha (Gautama) another Reformer, as noble and as loving, though less favored by opportunity, arose in another part of the world, among another and a less spiritual race. . . . There are many other strange points of similarity between Gautama and Jesus, which cannot be noticed here. . . . Jesus, who had promised His disciples the knowledge which confers upon man the power of producing 'miracles' far greater than He had ever produced Himself, died, leaving but a few faithful disciples—men only half-way to knowledge. They had therefore to struggle with a world to which they could impart only what they but half-knew themselves, and—no more. In later ages the exoteric followers of both mangled the truths given out, often out of recognition. With regard to the adherents of the Western Master, the proof of this lies in the very fact that none of them can now produce the promised 'miracles.' "

In several other passages, Mme. Blavatsky brings the personalities of the Buddha and Jesus together, as Avatars. We may gather these passages together. "As in the case of His Western successor, Gautama, the 'merciful,' the 'pure,' and the 'just,' was the first found in the Eastern Hierarchy of historical Adepts, if not in the world-annals of the divine mortals, who was moved by that generous feeling which locks the whole of mankind within one embrace, with no petty differences of race, birth or caste." "The students of Esoteric Philosophy see in the Naza-

rene sage a Bodhisattva with the spirit of Buddha Himself in Him." "The case of Jesus covers the ground for the same possibility in the cases of all Adepts and Avatars—such as Buddha, Shankaracharya, Krishna, etc." "Those great characters who tower like giants in the history of mankind like Siddhartha Buddha and Jesus. . . ." "Truly, 'for the salvation of the good and the destruction of wickedness,' the personalities known as Gautama, Shankara, Jesus and a few others were born each in his age, as declared—'I am born in every Yuga'—and they were all born through the same power. There is a great mystery in such incarnations and they are outside and beyond the cycle of general re-births. Re-births may be divided into three classes: the divine incarnations called Avatars; those of Adepts who give up Nirvana for the sake of helping humanity—the Nirmanakayas; and the natural succession of re-births for all—the common law." Here, by the way, is the true meaning the much misunderstood doctrine of "the immaculate conception." It indicates a re-birth of the first of these three classes, that of an Avatar or Divine Incarnation, one who comes to birth not of necessity but from compassion, for the salvation of mankind.

Having thus indicated the meaning and character of the birth of Jesus, as an Avatar, Mme. Blavatsky comments most illuminatingly on his teachings. Take for example such a passage as this: "Has the reader ever meditated upon the suggestive words, often pronounced by Jesus and his Apostles? "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father . . . is perfect' (Matt. v, 48), says the Great Master. . . . What was esoterically meant is, "Your Father who is above the material and astral man, the highest Principle (save the Monad) within man, his own personal God, the God of his personality, of whom he is the 'prison and the temple.' 'If thou wilt be perfect (*i. e.,* an Adept and Initiate) go and sell that thou hast' (Matt. xix, 21). Every man who desired to become a neophyte, a chela, then, as now, had to take the vow of poverty. The 'Perfect' was the name given to the Initiates of every denomination. Plato called them by that term. The Essenes had their 'Perfect,' and Paul plainly states that they, the Initiates, can only speak before other Adepts. 'We speak wisdom among them (only) that are perfect' (I Cor. ii, 6).

We have already cited a passage in which Mme. Blavatsky calls Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus—the former of whom lived just before, and the latter, just after, Jesus—to witness that the doctrine of reincarnation was familiar to the best Jewish thought of that time. To this Mme. Blavatsky added, that Jesus believed and taught the same doctrine, as the New Testament shows. We can supplement this by a later and much fuller passage: "The Delphic command 'Know thyself' was perfectly comprehensible to every nation of old. . . . To under-

stand its full meaning, however, necessitates, first of all, belief in reincarnation and all its mysteries. Their Saviour taught His disciples this grand truth of the Esoteric Philosophy, but verily, if His Apostles comprehended it, no one else seems to have realized its true meaning. No, not even Nicodemus, who, to the assertion, 'Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God,' answers: 'How can a man be born when he is old?' and is forthwith reproved by the remark: 'Art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things?'—as no one had a right to call himself a 'Master' and Teacher, without having been initiated into the mysteries (a) of a spiritual re-birth through water, fire and spirit, and (b) of the re-birth from flesh. Then again what can be a clearer expression as to the doctrine of manifold re-births than the answer given by Jesus to the Sadducees, 'who deny that there is any resurrection,' *i. e.,* any re-birth, since the dogma of the resurrection in the flesh is now regarded as an absurdity even by the intelligent clergy: 'They who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world (Nirvana) . . . neither marry . . . neither can they die any more,' which shows that they had already died, and more than once. And again: 'Now that the dead are raised even Moses shewed . . . he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, for he is not a God of the dead but of the living.' The sentence 'now that the dead *are raised*' evidently applied to the then actual re-births of the Jacobs and the Isaacs, and not to their future resurrection; for in such case they would have been still dead in the interim, and could not be referred to as 'living.' But the most suggestive of Christ's parables and 'dark sayings' is found in the explanation given by him to his Apostles about the blind man: 'Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?' Jesus answered, 'Neither hath this (blind, physical) man sinned nor his parents; but that the works of (his) god should be made manifest in him.' Man is the 'tabernacle,' the 'building' only, of his God; and of course it is not the temple but its inmate—the vehicle of 'God'—(the conscious Ego, or Fifth Principle, Manas, the vehicle of the divine Monad, or 'God')—that had sinned in a previous incarnation, and had thus brought the Karma of cecity [blindness] upon the new building. Thus Jesus spoke truly; but to this day his followers have refused to understand the words of wisdom spoken."

We may supplement this by a few shorter passages: "From Prometheus to Jesus, and from Him to the highest Adept as to the lowest disciple, every revealer of mysteries has had to become a Chrestos, a 'man of sorrows,' and a martyr. 'Beware,' said one of the greatest Masters, 'of revealing the mystery to those without'—to the profane, the Sadducee and the unbeliever." "If Jesus pronounced the words in the sense attributed to him, then he must have read the *Book of Enoch.* . . . Moreover, he could not have been ignorant that these words

belonged to the oldest ritual of Initiation." "And this—leaving the divine and mystic character and claims for Jesus entirely independent of this event of His mortal life—shows Him, beyond any doubt, as an Initiate of the Egyptian Mysteries." After such explicit statements as the foregoing, it is almost incongruous to cite the following passage, which, nevertheless, is essential to a clear understanding of the whole position: "And now once more we have to beg the reader not to lend an ear to the charge—against Theosophy in general and the writer [H. P. Blavatsky] in particular—of disrespect toward one of the greatest and noblest characters in the history of Adeptship—Jesus of Nazareth —nor even of hatred to the Church."

We come now to the mystery of the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus. We may lead up to this by citing the following, concerning the raising of the dead: "Those who showed such powers were forthwith set above the crowds, and were regarded as Kings and Initiates. Gautama Buddha was a King-Initiate, a healer, and recalled to life those who were in the hands of death. Jesus and Apollonius were healers, and were both addressed as Kings by their followers. Had they failed to raise those who were to all intents and purposes the dead, none of their names would have passed down to posterity; for this was the first and crucial test, the certain sign that the Adept had upon Him the invisible hand of a primordial divine Master, or was an incarnation of one of the 'Gods.'" This leads us naturally to such a passage as this: "The false rendering of a number of parables and sayings of Jesus is not to be wondered at in the least. From Orpheus, the first initiated Adept of whom history catches a glimpse in the mists of the pre-Christian era, down through Pythagoras, Confucius, Buddha, Jesus, Apollonius of Tyana, to Ammonius Saccas, no Teacher or Initiate has ever committed anything to writing for public use. Each and all of them have invariably recommended silence and secresy on certain facts and deeds. From Confucius . . . to Jesus, who charged his disciples to tell no man that he was Christ (Chrestos), the 'man of sorrows' and trials, before his supreme and last Initiation, or that he had produced a miracle of resurrection."

We have already seen Mme. Blavatsky speaking of the possible relation of Jesus, during the mysterious period between his twelfth and thirtieth year, with the mystical sects of Palestine, especially the Essenes and Nazars. This leads us to the following: "What say the Ophites, the Nazarenes, and other 'heretics'? Sophia, 'the Celestial Virgin,' is prevailed upon to send Christos, her emanation, to the help of perishing humanity, from whom Ilda-Baoth and his six Sons of Matter (the lower terrestrial angels) are shutting out the divine light. Therefore Christos, the perfect, 'uniting himself with Sophia (divine wisdom) descended

through the seven planetary regions, assuming in each an analogous form . . . (and) entered into the man Jesus at the moment of his baptism in the Jordan. From this time forth Jesus began to work miracles; before that he had been entirely ignorant of his own mission. Ilda-Baoth, discovering that Christos was bringing to an end his kingdom of Matter, stirred up the Jews against Him, and Jesus was put to death. When Jesus was on the Cross, Christos and Sophia left His body, and returned to their own sphere. The material body of Jesus was abandoned to the earth, but He Himself, the Inner Man, was clothed with a body made up of *æther*. Thenceforth He consisted merely of soul and spirit. . . . During His sojourn upon earth of eighteen months after He had risen, He received from Sophia that perfect knowledge, that true Gnosis, which he communicated to the small portion of the Apostles who were capable of receiving the same.' "

Mme. Blavatsky even more clearly reveals the truth concerning the Resurrection of Jesus in the following: " 'Let me suffer and bear the sins of all (be reincarnated unto new misery) but let the world be saved!' was said by Gautama Buddha: an exclamation the real meaning of which is little understood now by his followers. 'If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?' asked the astral Jesus of Peter. 'Till I come' means 'till I am reincarnated again' in a physical body. Yet the Christ of the old crucified body could truly say: 'I am with my Father and one with Him,' which did not prevent the astral from taking a form again, or John from tarrying indeed till his Master had come; nor hinder John from failing to recognize him . . . Since then the 'Man of Sorrows' has returned, perchance, more than once, unknown to, and undiscovered by, his blind followers. Since then also, this grand 'Son of God' has been incessantly and most cruelly crucified daily and hourly by the Churches founded in his name. But the Apostles, only half-initiated, failed to tarry for their Master, and not recognizing Him, spurned Him every time he returned." "He who was meekness and charity personified" "the Grand Martyr has remained thenceforward, and for eighteen centuries, the Victim crucified daily."

FRAGMENTS

DISAPPOINTMENT, you say, is one of the greatest sorrows in life—and when you say that, I must agree with you.

But I would ask you to look into the matter with me; for all sorrow has meaning, nay, even blessing, hidden in its heart; and the heart of life is what we are seeking, you and I.

Why are we disappointed?

Because something we longed for has been denied, or something we loved has been taken away. Without our cherished plan or object, life loses purpose and attractiveness, and settles into the perpetual greyness of a November day. There are those who love their Novembers, however. Not from a morbid love of an indulged sadness,—the re-action of undigested experience;—but from the trained ability to perceive subtile tones of beauty; that keener vision which senses the finer colour gradations unmarked by the ordinary eye.

So, also, when in this month the Church reminds us of our dead, those of spiritual thought and heart do not mourn "as those without hope"; but facing our Good Friday in the light of Easter Day, experience some meaning of the Communion of Saints, catch some vision of the immortality of love, and so place our feet on the bed-rock of life and know the peace of its security. Nothing less immortal than itself can ever satisfy an immortal soul. The Divine Powers, knowing this, break or disentangle one by one all our attachments unrooted in the Eternal, drawing us back from them before the tie becomes too strong for severence.

So disappointments, may be, are calls for home; and much of the misunderstood pain in them lies in the nostalgia they awaken for the heritage we have lost or not yet gained, but which shall surely yet be ours.

For under the veil of sorrow and disillusionment an infinite compassion is drawing us,—patient with our impatience, tender with our blindness and rebellion,—drawing us surely to our enlightenment and to our joy.

CAVÉ.

EARLY ENGLISH MYSTICS

WHEN it was suggested that an account of some of the early English Mystics might be acceptable to the readers of the QUARTERLY, nothing more was in my mind than a record of such devout and little known authors as Richard Rolle of Hampole, Margery Kemp, Dame Gertrude More, and others, from the fourteenth century onward. But as I read the records of interior living which those aspiring souls have left for our instruction, I became desirous of following back the "Apostolic succession" of these holy men and women, to trace a ray of discipleship, the spiritual laying on of hands. I hoped that a line of spiritual descent might be shown. For, with a long and noble ancestry, an individual would not appear, as he usually does in the world, an isolated and fortuitous phenomenon; he would seem purposed. And the purpose back of and directing such a noble line might in some measure, perhaps, be discerned and set forth by those whose wise intuitions could read within the records that furnish this narrative.

So, as I looked afield for the teachers of those fourteenth century monks and anchorites, France at once rose in sight, and that part of France that centered around the Abbey of St. Victor. And as I placed myself in the celebrated Abbey and school of mystics, and looked back for its predecessor, I had to recross the English Channel, and find a teacher and inspiration in Scotus Erigena, the Irish priest and philosopher. For several centuries France and Britain (including Ireland) taught each other, turn by turn, the Wisdom of the Cross. Thus when St. Augustine landed at Thanet in 596 and proceeded thence to establish at Canterbury the Benedictine mode of life, he gathered his followers for prayer in a Christian Church of an earlier period dedicated to St. Martin. St. Martin was a Bishop of Tours and head of the first monastic group in western Europe; he had learned his mode of living in the East. Thus as I studied, and followed up clues, I soon found myself reading again the beloved book of the Venerable Bede; and going back of the period which he authoritatively relates, I came upon the life and labours of the great apostle to the Irish, Patrick, and that other great apostle, Columba.

Wonderful lights gleamed as I read. These shone chiefly from the golden pages of one precious book—a history of Ireland.* Without that book I could have made little progress in the pleasant labor I had undertaken. For as I studied the lives of ancient saints and mystics, I saw that they led an inner life and an outer. To them the real life was the inner; they passed their days with a band or school of young

* Ireland; Historic and Picturesque, by Charles Johnston. Henry T. Coates & Co., Philadelphia.

students, learning the secrets of spiritual living—the Wisdom of the Cross. From that study of prayer wonderful strength and powers came to them; and there passed out into the world rumors of the extraordinary wisdom and powers of these recluses. The world, eager to secure able leaders to push its affairs, often dragged these students of interior living away from their solitude—in the case of St. Martin, he was captured in ambush and carried off—and made them bishops, etc. Their deeds as bishops and missionaries were by-products of prayer. But often outer acts—distorted accounts of them—are all that remain to us, and it is not easy to see, beneath the accumulation of legend, the real facts and the real significances. Through this difficulty I was guided by the great book I have mentioned—a history of Ireland. Unlike all other histories I know about, that book records the centuries as moments in the being of Eternal Silence: it fixes its attention on the inner side of life. If there be any portion of truth and help in what I may now write, I feel that it has passed into my study from that history and from other papers of its author, on kindred themes, which I have, most undeservedly, been permitted to see.

I

ST. PATRICK

"There was no desert, no spot, or hiding-place in the island, however remote, which was not peopled with perfect monks and nuns; so that, throughout the world, Ireland was justly distinguished by the extraordinary title of the Island of the Saints.

"In holy mortification of the flesh and renouncement of self-will, rivalling the Monks of Egypt in merits and in numbers, and by word and example, they were a light to foreign and distant lands."

Christ with me, Christ before me,
Christ behind me, Christ within me,
Christ beneath me, Christ above me,
Christ at my right, Christ at my left,
Christ in the fort,
Christ in the chariot-seat,
Christ in the heart of every man who thinks of me,
Christ in the mouth of every man who speaks to me,
Christ in every eye that sees me,
Christ in every ear that hears me."

—Old Irish hymn attributed to St. Patrick.

St. Patrick's life and labors fall in the fourth epoch of Ireland's history. The conditions into which he came, the fertility of the ground

ploughed and harrowed to receive his seed, the harvest that was reaped, evidence august laws that were guiding the Irish peoples. A period of war and conquest, and a period of efflorescence preceded. Yet the inner essence of St. Patrick's message, the teaching of the Wisdom Religion, is found in Ireland, even in the early period of conquest. The tradition is that, in the early time, various tribes and races were distributed in Ireland, as later, in England, the Saxons and Teutons and Normans were neighbors. One race of invaders that fought the established nations, as Saxon fought Celt in England, was known as the Sons of Milid. Milid was the son of Belor, the lord of Death, who gives to mortals, turn by turn, both death and life. Tradition says that a poet accompanied the Sons of Milid in their expeditions, and when he sprang ashore, he sang this hymn to the God through whose might the Sons of Milid would conquer the land:

I am the wind which blows over the sea;
I am the wave of the Ocean;
I am the murmur of the billows;
I am the ox of the seven combats;
I am the vulture upon the rock;
I am a tear of the sun;
I am the fairest of plants;
I am a wild boar in valour;
I am a salmon in the water;
I am a lake in the plain.
I am a word of science;
I am the spear-point that gives battle;
I am the god who creates or forms in the head of man the fire of thought.
Who is it that enlightens the assembly upon the mountain?
Who telleth the ages of the moon?
Who showeth the place where the sun goes to rest?

Monsieur de Jubainville, in his history of Celtic Mythology, points out that the philosophy of this mythological bard is the very doctrine that John Erigena brought with him from Ireland, and taught in France in the 9th century. Thus the golden vein of Wisdom is seen extending through Ireland's history.

Through the achievements of the various races, first in war and afterwards in peace, a fine civilization developed. "The arts of life were very perfect; the gold-work of that time is unsurpassed. At a far earlier time there were beautifully moulded and decorated gold-bronze spears, that show what richness of feeling and imagination, what just taste and fine skill were there. The modern work of countries where gold is found in quantities is commonplace, vulgar and inartistic

when compared with the work of the old Irish period." Ireland seems, in the old days, 2,000 years ago and more, to have reached the point mentioned in *Light on the Path*—where man is at his fruition, and civilization at its height; a point at which it became possible for man to claim his great inheritance and to lose the incumbrance of the mere animal life. That claim was made for Ireland by St. Patrick. The perfect bloom of the natural man faded and withered, and the immortal beauty of the spiritual nature began to unfold its petals.

Patrick was born about 389 at a little village in Scotland south of Hadrian's wall. His father was a Roman citizen. His mother was a Gaul, and a relative of St. Martin. Patrick's real name was Succat, and his father's Calphurnius. But the father was of patrician rank and the pagan title became the name of the Saint. Calphurnius was a Christian, and of the order of Deacons in the Church, the son of a priest. Patrick's life was uneventful until his sixteenth year. At that time he was taken prisoner along with many others, was carried off to Ireland, and sold as a slave. Outwardly a hard fate—a Roman, a patrician, and a Christian, to become servant to a pagan. That catastrophe, however, was opportunity for the development of the inward life. For six years he tended cattle. In those years of exile, words that had earlier sounded only in his ears began to take on an inward meaning for his heart. He began to pray, and to hear answers to his prayers.

> "Now after I came to Ireland daily I herded flocks, and often during the day I prayed. Love of God and His fear increased more and more, and my faith grew, and my spirit was stirred up, so that in a single day I said as many as a hundred prayers, and at night likewise, though I abode in the woods and in the mountain. Before the dawn I used to be aroused to prayer in snow and frost and rain, nor was there any tepidity in me, such as I now feel, because then the spirit was fervent within me."

At the end of six years of captivity, Patrick heard in sleep one night a voice saying: "You have fasted well, and soon you shall see your home and your native land." Shortly after the same voice said: "The ship is ready for you." Patrick's servitude was passed near the western coast of Ireland. The ship in which he escaped lay in port about two hundred miles away. To reach it he had to travel in danger of pursuit through an unknown region. He went without fear, he says, and found the ship by divine guidance. Three days' sail brought the crew to the coast of France, where they disembarked, and journeyed afoot, in all, thirty-eight days. At last Patrick was able to separate from the crew, and, by divine guidance again, was led to a lonely island off the southern coast of France.

In that desert island, Lerins,—now called by the great teacher's own name, St. Honorat—Honoratus, mindful of Patmos and the beloved

disciple, had gathered together a group of disciples to whom he was handing down the mystery of "the Way." St. John and Patmos! It is the beloved disciple, not Peter, who is the father of the French and the British Churches. And it is his long life, radiant and serene within the Sacred Heart, that set the example of true discipleship for France and for Britain. If that portion of Christendom which is in direct descent from the Apostolate of John, has forgotten its goodly heritage and noble lineage, and is stupidly tramping out the husks of Roman materialism, perhaps a reminder of its high ancestry may reach the prodigal heart and stir it to return to its true Shepherd and Bishop. It is singular how incurious we are as to the life of John after his Master's withdrawal. And our materialism blinds us to the record he has left in the Apocalypse of his life's culmination. But John's own disciples knew of his intercourse with the Master and of the continuance of the Master's personal teaching. And when they left Asia to settle in southern France, they carried with them certainty as to the possibility of such intercourse with a living Friend, and of direct personal instruction from a Master and Teacher. Their efforts, and their successors' efforts, were to form groups of aspirants, who through training, might grow into the high privilege of discipleship. The warrant for such efforts was the Master's own example, who, from the thousands to whom He spoke, selected the few who could be taught the "mysteries of the Kingdom." The island monastery of Lerins off southern France, and the island monastery, Iona of Scotland, very clearly continue the tradition of St. John and of Patmos.

A few names and dates will make clear this connection of St. Patrick and St. Columba and British Christianity with the beloved disciple. Irenæus, the great champion of orthodoxy against heresies which were receiving shelter under the Bishop of Rome, was Bishop of Lyons and southern France from 175 to 202. There is a letter of Irenæus to a friend Florinus that contains the following statements:

> "I saw you when I was yet, as a boy, in Lower Asia with Polycarp. . . . I could even now point out the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and spoke, and describe his going out and coming in, his manner of life, his personal appearance, the addresses he delivered to the multitude, how he spoke of his intercourse with John and with others who had seen the Lord, and how he recalled their words. And everything that he had heard from them about the Lord, about His miracles and His teaching, Polycarp told us, as one who had received it from those who had seen the Word of Life with their own eyes, and all this in complete harmony with the Scriptures. To this I then listened, through the mercy of God vouchsafed to me, with all eagerness, and wrote it not on paper, but in my heart, and still by the grace of God I ever bring it into fresh remembrance."

Polycarp, the teacher whom Irenæus mentions, was martyred in Smyrna about 150 A. D. Before his death Polycarp had sent his disciple, the priest Pothinus, to southern France, and there Irenæus joined Pothinus, after the death of Polycarp. Harnack makes this comment on the letter of Irenæus to Florinus: "These are priceless words, for they establish a chain of tradition (Jesus, John, Polycarp, Irenæus) which is without a parallel in history." Irenæus died at the beginning of the third century. Honoratus, the abbot of the island monastery to which Patrick was led after his escape from captivity, was born 350 A. D. Martin of Tour, whose monastery has already been mentioned, was born in 316 A. D.

Honoratus had gone with his brother to a spiritual, monastic centre somewhere in the East in search of training. But on the death of his brother he returned to France to make a centre of himself. "He was directed," writes Professor Bury, "to the uncouth islet of Lerinus, which no man tilled or approached because it was infested by snakes. Honoratus took possession of it and reclaimed it for cultivation. Wells were dug, and sweet water flowed 'in the midst of the bitterness of the sea.' Vines were planted and cells were built, and a little monastic community gathered around Honoratus, destined within a few years to be more illustrious than any of the other island cloisters."

This spiritual center was Patrick's first school after his conversion. He spent many years there. It became to him the norm of a religious life. It was the pattern that he handed on. A century after his death when Columba carried the good news from Ireland to Scotland, Iona, the holy isle, reproduced Lerins. The method of life which Patrick learned at Lerins had its source not in Rome, but in the East; in fact it might be called Egyptian. For Honoratus, on his arrival in southern France was closely associated with Cassian, and so won the admiration and respect of that learned monk, that Cassian dedicated to him the second book of his great work, the *Conferences.* That book, the *Conferences,* is made up of the interviews and discourses which Cassian had listened to from Egyptian teachers. For thirty years, in his passion for training, Cassian had gone about among the spiritual teachers of the Egyptian desert, and had learned the method of each. These Egyptian groups had been gathered together chiefly by Pachomius (292-350) from solitary worshippers who had made cells for themselves in the desert. During the many years of residence in the different monastic groups, Cassian gathered material for two treatises. The first of these is the *Institutes,* which is concerned with the outer organization and life of the group. The second and greater book, the *Conferences,* deals, Cassian writes, "rather with the training of the inner man and the perfection of the heart." After those long years of study—for Cassian had lived in Palestine before going to Egypt—Cassian crossed over to southern France as the field of his own labor, and founded near Marseilles a monastic group of men, and another of women. There he met Honora-

tus, who was also inspired by Eastern ideals, and in sympathy and admiration dedicated to him the second portion of the *Conferences*. So it seems entirely reasonable to assume that the group at Lerins of which Honoratus was the head, very fairly reproduced what Cassian had learned to esteem in Egypt as the true type of Christian life. Mr. Johnston calls attention to a very interesting fact in regard to Patrick and the Mediterranean islet. "It is that the chapel of Honoratus, in which Patrick worshipped during several years, is dedicated to the Trinity, and is distinguished architecturally by a triple apse—three bays in the eastern end of the Chapel—typifying the Triune Godhead. The eastern end of the chapel floor and ceiling are, therefore, in form like a trefoil or shamrock; and it may well be this familiar building which suggested to Patrick the simile of the shamrock to illustrate the teaching of the Trinity."

When Patrick had learned at Lerins the meaning of a religious life, he returned from the Mediterranean to Scotland. His friends welcomed him as a son. But his sojourn was not for long. In sleep he had been called away from Ireland out of earthly servitude. Now in sleep he is called back to Ireland in servitude to a divine Master, as St. Paul was summoned into Macedonia. "Now there it was I saw, in a vision of the night, a man coming as if from Ireland, whose name was Victoricus, with very many letters. And he gave one of them to me, and I read the beginning of the letter purporting to be the 'Voice of the Irish,' and whilst I was reading out the beginning of the letter, I thought that at that moment I heard the voices of those who dwelt beside the wood of Foclut, which is by the western sea; and thus they cried, as if with one mouth: 'We beseech thee, holy youth, to come and walk once more amongst us.' And I was greatly touched in heart, and could read no more, and so I awoke.

"And on another night, whether within me or beside me, I know not, God knoweth, in the clearest words which I heard but could not understand until the end of the prayer, He spoke thus: 'He who laid down His life for thee, He it is who speaketh within thee.' And so I awoke full of joy. And once more I saw Him praying in me, and He was as it were within my body; and I heard Him over me, that is over the interior man; and there strongly he prayed with groanings. And meanwhile I was astonished and marvelled, and considered who it was who prayed within me; but at the end of the prayer He spoke out to the effect that He was the spirit."

To prepare for his Irish mission, Patrick went a second time into France to a monastic centre. This time he was associated with St. Germain, Bishop of Auxerre, who like Martin of Tours, came from a soldier family. The story told of him is as follows: He was a proud and mighty hunter, and hung the heads of his prizes, not in his hall,

but on a tree of his garden. The local bishop saw in these votives an out-cropping of the old pagan worship, and during an absence of Germain, he had the tree hewn and the votives scattered about. Anger separated the hunter Germain and the bishop until just before the latter's death, when he was told to consecrate Germain his successor. This had to be done almost by force; but once consecrated, Germain became a zealous Christian, and established a monastic community similar to that at Lerins. It was he who after several years consecrated Patrick Bishop of Ireland. In 429 he was summoned into Britain as champion of orthodoxy against the heretical Pelagius, just as Irenæus had defended the faith against the Gnostics, and Martin against the Arians. Patrick seems to have accompanied St. Germain on that mission.

A third eminent leader and saint with whom Patrick is associated in France, is St. Martin. But as St. Martin died in 397, Patrick's association must have been with the great abbot's disciples in the large monastery near Tours—the famous Marmoutier (great monastery).

Martin was born in 316, the son of a Roman tribune in Hungary, who for his services was granted a home and land in Italy. In Italy the boy grew up, and became a postulant or catechumen. It was many years later that he received the Sacrament of Baptism. The seriousness and reality of that ceremony in the early days of the Church puts to shame the thoughtlessness and haste with which infants are now hurried to the font. There was a long preparation, for weeks, of fasting and prayer. And for eight days after, the neophyte wore his white robes. The idea of a secluded life took hold of Martin very early. But he had to defer his hopes until he had completed his military service. At last, freed from outer claims, Martin journeyed to France to associate himself with Hilary, another French religious, who like Honoratus journeyed to the East, and knew of the Eastern ideals of spiritual training. But his stay with Hilary was brief. After a sojourn in Hungary, he stopped at Milan, and with a few followers began a monastic life outside the city. But the Arian heretics whom it was his duty to oppose, troubled his quiet there, so with a single priest, he took refuge on a barren islet in the Gulf of Genoa. There he continued his rule of prayer and meditation, maintaining physical life on the berries and roots of the island, until he was able to go back into France to Hilary. Hilary wanted the assistance of so able a man as Martin in the external affairs of the Church. But Martin begged permission to continue the ascetic life of prayer, and Hilary, who understood and sympathised, granted the request. Martin withdrew to an uncultivated region some miles from Poitiers, built his cell, and soon had many sons who sought his training; for many years the quiet study of spiritual science was undisturbed.

But finally Tours needed a Bishop. Martin had declined the position when Hilary died. But on the death of Hilary's successor, the people said Martin must come. He was led to the Cathedral by

stratagem, and at length consented to consecration. But he by no means abandoned his teaching with the assumption of the executive office. He found near Tours, a spot well secluded by the river, with natural cells, and there he established a spiritual school similar to the one from which he had been taken away. Fame of Martin's sanctity drew to him the devout, and the miracles that resulted from his powers in prayer drew the curious. Among the devout who sought him was Ninian, a Welshman, who had been educated in Rome. On his way back from Rome to Britain, Ninian stopped at Tours to converse with a man who had travelled so far along the Path. Impressed by what he saw, Ninian crossed over to England, proceeded north to Galloway, built a stone Church which was so unusual that it became known as the *Candida Casa* (White House), and consecrated it in the name of St. Martin. Gradually men came to him for training as they had gone to Martin, Honoratus, and others; a monastery grew up, and in the sixth century his school had become famous. Thus before Gregory's ambassador, Augustine, landed at Thanet in 596, at least two churches bore witness to the sanctity of St. Martin, and the high reverence given to the monastic mode of life—the *Candida Casa* of Ninian and the Church of St. Martin at Canterbury.

With the training given by three such teachers as St. Honoratus, St. Germain and St. Martin, Patrick set out upon his mission. He journeyed through Ireland as Paul did through Asia and Europe, and as Fox and Wesley, later, went through England. He reached the Western Ocean and the dwellers by the forest of Foclut, whose voices he had heard. He founded churches and monasteries for his converts on land given to him by chieftains who were moved by his character and his ideals. None of the Messengers of the New Way, as they were called first by St. Luke, unless the phrase is St. Paul's, accomplished single-handed so wonderful a work, conquering so large a territory, and leaving such enduring monuments of his victory. Amongst the world's masters, the son of Calpurn the Decurion deserves a place with the greatest.

> "Not less noteworthy than the wide range of his work was the way in which he gained success. He addressed himself always to the chiefs, the kings, the men of personal weight and power. And his address was almost invariably successful,—a thing that would have been impossible had he not been himself a personality of singular force and fire, able to meet the great ones of the land as an equal."

Patrick has left two chief writings, his *Confession* and a *Letter to Coroticus*. He was not a learned man, and he regrets it. The two writings mentioned were made necessary by his outer fortunes. The *Letter to Coroticus* was a protest against the murder of some neophytes "in their white robes, the baptismal chrism still fragrant on their foreheads." The *Confession,* written shortly before his death, contains the

autobiographical data which furnish the present article, though it is not an autobiography. "It is the story of the most vital event in the life of Ireland, in the words of the man who was chiefly instrumental in bringing it about. Though an unskilled writer, as he says himself, he has nevertheless succeeded in breathing into every part of his epistle the power and greatness of his soul, the sense and vivid reality of the divine breath which stirred in him and transformed him, the spiritual power, humane and universal, which enkindled him from within; these are the words of a man who had first-hand knowledge of the things of our deeper life; not a mere servant of tradition, living on the words and convictions of other men. He has drawn in large and universal outline the death to egotism—reached in his case through hunger, nakedness and slavery—and the new birth from above, the divine Soul enkindling the inner man, and wakening him to new powers and a knowledge of his genius and immortal destiny."

The *Confession* and the *Letter* are found in the "Book of Armagh," a manuscript written in 808, and now in Trinity College, Dublin. The scribe who made the Book of Armagh copied from older manuscripts. There seems to be no doubt among scholars as to the genuineness of the writings. Besides these writings of St. Patrick's, the "Book of Armagh" contains also the (Latin) life of Martin of Tours, written by his friend and disciple, Sulpicius Severus, and dialogues and letters about St. Martin which are attributed to Sulpicius. That life of St. Martin in so early a manuscript as the Irish "Book of Armagh," that is copied from older manuscripts, is another evidence of the very high esteem in which St. Martin was held.

The well-known hymn of St. Patrick, a stanza of which heads this article, is very ancient, but is not certainly Patrick's. He was very friendly with the Bards who formed a separate and privileged class in Ireland, and accepted the young pupils of the Bards as Christian novices. There is no evidence that Patrick himself was a poet. His mother tongue was Latin, though he forgot it and had to learn it again. His *Confession* is in Latin.

SPENCER MONTAGUE.

SHANKARACHARYA'S CATECHISM*

Introduction

THIS charming little treatise bears in Sanskrit the title *Tattva Bodha,* which means "The Awakening to Reality," or, to translate quite literally, "The Awakening to That-ness." It is characteristic of Sanskrit that, in this "language of the gods," the most vital words declare their own meanings. For example, *Satya,* the Sanskrit word for "truth," by its very form announces its meaning: truth is "that which belongs to *being, Sat*"; and "being" is "that which endures through the three times," past, present, future; that which is eternal. The Real, therefore, is the Eternal; and Truth is what belongs to the Eternal. So, the unreal is the non-eternal, the temporal, the transitory. To say, in the thought of India, that this world is "unreal" means not so much that it is an "illusion" as that it is not everlasting. For the thought of ancient India, for the thought of the great school to which Shankaracharya belongs, only what is everlasting deserves the name of real. Therefore the title of our text means, in its fullest sense, "the Awakening to the nature of That, which is the Everlasting." And the knowledge of the Eternal is to be attained, be it noted, not by analysis or argument, whether deductive or inductive, but by "awakening": by the unveiling of a new consciousness. In the same sense, Siddhartha the Compassionate, in whom the "cosmic consciousness" had revealed the secret of Nirvana, is called the Buddha, the "Awakened," he whose eyes behold the everlasting day.

This little treatise illustrates above all things the lucidity of Shankaracharya, the clearest, serenest spirit that ever set forth the mystery of holy things; just as "The Awakening to the Self" shows the beauty, the poetry of his luminous soul. In the simplest form, question and answer, he leads us along the path of wisdom. "What is wisdom?" "The knowledge of Atman, the Self." "What is the Self?" "That which appears as consciousness in the three bodies, the outer, the inner, the causal, but in its own nature transcends them, being, indeed, immortal, omniscient Joy."

In order the better to bring out the content of Shankara's teaching, we have ventured to add to the text a brief commentary, to supply to the Western reader that which is in the mind of every Eastern student, the splendid spiritual tradition of Mother India. And to bring the teaching closer to ourselves, we have added many parallels from the

* Copyright, 1913, by Charles Johnston.

works of a Western mystic, Miguel de Molinos, who, perhaps, of all Christian writers, comes closest to the Oriental method and spirit.

We end this introduction with an Eastern prayer: May the work bring blessing to reader and writer alike!

THE AWAKENING TO REALITY

With reverent adoration of the Logos, the Lord of those who seek for Union, the giver of Wisdom, the Initiator, this teaching of the Awakening to Reality is set forth, to give aid to those who are seeking Liberation.

The word translated here 'the Logos' is, in the Sanskrit Vasudeva, a name given in the Bhagavad Gita to Krishna as the Incarnation of Vishnu, who is the second Person of the Trinity, God made manifest in the world. We may realize the full meaning of our text by comparing with it these verses of the Gita:

"The seeker for Union, thus ever joining himself in Union, his darkness gone, happily attains the infinite joy of Union with the Eternal.

"He sees his soul as one with all beings, and all beings as one with his soul; his soul joined in Union, beholding Oneness everywhere.

"Who sees Me everywhere, and sees all in Me, him I lose not, nor will he lose Me.

"Who, resting in Oneness, loves Me dwelling in all beings, wheresoever he may turn this follower of Union dwells in Me.

"Who through loving all as himself beholds Oneness everywhere, whether it be in joy or sorrow, that follower of Union is deemed supreme." (vi, 28-32.)

Compare the words of the Western mystic, Miguel de Molinos:

"There the Soul, raised and uplifted into this passive state, finds herself united to the Highest Good, although this Union costs her no fatigue. There in that supreme Region, and sacred temple of the Soul, the Highest Good delights to abide, to manifest Himself, to give Himself to the Creature, in a way transcending Sense and all human Understanding. There also, the one pure Spirit Who is God (for the purified Soul is not capable of receiving images of the senses) dominates the Soul and masters her, instilling into her His own Enlightenment; and the knowledge which is requisite for the most pure and perfect Union." (*Spiritual Guide,* Book iii, Chapter 13.)

The invocation to the Logos has a close parallel in Molinos' book:

"All holy, expert and mystic Teachers, teach this true and important Doctrine, because they have all had one and the same Master Who is the Holy Spirit." (i, 15.)

We shall declare the manner of the Discernment of Reality, which becomes the instrument of Liberation for those who are qualified by possessing the Four Attainments.

This has been for ages a fundamental idea in the religious and philosophical thought of the East: that one must have reached a certain

poise and stature, must have attained to a certain maturity of thought and experience, before the search of the Soul can be wisely and fruitfully followed. "Ripeness is all." We are familiar with the saying: "Before the eyes can see, they must be incapable of tears." The idea is the same. We must have learned the simpler lessons of natural life with some thoroughness, before we are ready to enter on the lessons of spiritual life. For this purpose, indeed, natural life exists, to give the soul its training in the preliminary lessons. This is the justification of the very existence of natural life. It exists, not for itself, or for any end of its own, but for spiritual life, of which it is, indeed, the reflection, the inverted image. And just because this world is the image of spiritual life, the soul can here learn the first outlines of the greater lessons only fully to be learned in spiritual life; the Soul can here begin to attain the qualities and powers which it is later to develop and use in a wider, a finer world. Therefore, only after the outlines are learned, is the soul ready for the fuller picture.

Molinos also begins his treatise with the statement of four attainments, which must be possessed before the way can be entered:

"Thou art to know, that thy Soul is the Centre, Habitation, and Kingdom of God. That, therefore, to the end the Sovereign King may rest on that Throne, thou oughtest to take pains to keep the Soul pure, quiet, void and peaceable; pure from guilt and defects; quiet from fears; void of affections, desires, and thoughts; and peaceable in temptations and tribulations." (i, 1.)

What are the Four Attainments? They are these:

First, Discernment between immortal and mortal being.

Second, Ceasing from the desire to feast on the fruit of our worth, whether in this world or in the other world.

Third, The group of Six Treasures, beginning with Peace.

Fourth, The longing for Liberation.

It is like setting forth on a voyage. We need four things: first, a clear knowledge of the port we seek, as our journey's end, a realization of whither we wish to go; second, a willingness to leave behind us the harbor from which we are setting forth, with a further determination to go forward, not to be detained on our way; third, the needed supplies for the voyage, the proper provisioning of our ship; fourth, the driving power, the strong and determined going forward, once we are set forth. We must 'press toward the mark.'

What is Discernment between immortal and mortal being?

This is Discernment between immortal and mortal being: The One, the Eternal, is immortal; everything that is separated from the Eternal is mortal.

The earlier training through the life of the natural world, which we have spoken of as the necessary preliminary to the entry into spiritual life, consists essentially in this: that, through the manifold experiences

of natural life, birth and death, union and separation, wealth and poverty, friendship and loneliness, the Soul may come to a certain firmness and poise, and to an intuitive understanding and certainty that there is another world, not subject to these mutations.

This intuitive sense may be reached, and perhaps is oftenest reached, through bitter suffering and sorrow, where the soul, destitute, afflicted, tormented, driven to desperation, nevertheless does not despair but finds within itself a reserve force, a divine quality which enables it to rise above sorrow, saying: "Even though all things seem to fall in ruin about me, to fail and wither away, yet I am; and, because I am, therefore God is also." This return of the Soul upon itself is, indeed, the divine fruit and purpose of sorrow, which is the first counselor and liberator of the Soul.

Or the same result may be gained, not through weakness, but through strength. The Soul, feeling its own divine quality and temper, may say: "These things of the world have their attraction and their qualities, but they are not enough for me. I seek my own, and must seek it till I find." But it is possible that this intuition may be the fruit of the return through sorrow, already reached in an earlier life.

The way may be found through the will. Through much assertion of one's own will, following one's own passionate desires, seeking one's own satisfaction, one may come into pain and misery unendurable, and, turning in agony toward the divine power dimly felt in the darkness, may cry out: "I am lonely and miserable and wretched; take me and make of me what Thou wilt; take my will and make it Thine. Only deliver me from the intolerable burden of myself."

Here, too, we may find the way, not through weakness, but through strength; through the intuitive sense that, for every action and work, there is a divine and excellent way, not of our making or planning, but nevertheless ever within our reach, if only we are willing to take it; thoroughly giving up our own way, that we may follow the greater, divine way; wholly laying aside our will and wish, that we may carry out the wish and will of God.

The artist's instinct for perfection is a part of this intuition. Without reasoning, he feels within him that there is an ideal to express, an ideally best way to express it; and this he seeks, never quite attaining, but always devoutly following, in ardent self-forgetfulness.

Or the way may be found through sheer love of Those who have attained, and the desire to follow in their steps. To this end, They come again, that they make manifest the way, that they may show us how full of love, how adorable, is the Divine.

But before we can find the way along any of these lines, we must have pretty thoroughly learned the earlier lessons; we must

have reached a pretty strong and matured conviction that the visible is not all, and is not enough. While we are entirely satisfied with it, content to stumble along, desiring no change nor anything better, we are not yet ready for the greater way.

What is Ceasing from desire?

It is a freedom from any wish for the feasts of this world or Paradise.

It is not enough to have an intuitive sense that there is a better world, a better way, a better will, a better self. One needs something more, and more positive than this: We must definitely and really and effectively prefer the better way, the better will, the better self. Very much of the misery of the world, a misery far keener than sickness or poverty or destitution, lies in this, that so many of us vaguely, or even clearly, feel the pressure of the better self and the better way, and yet do not effectively choose and prefer that way. We feel the leading and prompting of the diviner will, but we are not yet ready to follow; we hear, as though afar off, the divine command, but we are not yet ready to obey. So we hesitate and hold back in miserable indecision and cowardice, which is indeed the worst of all miseries. There is no cure for cowardice but courage, no cure for indecision but resolute will, no way to pass the danger zone on the path, but once for all to make up our minds to do what we know we ought to do.

This effective and sincere preferring of the divine will to our own wills is the attainment here described. It breaks the galling fetters of our indecision and hesitation, and sends us forth, warriors, to the battle.

The Western mystic expresses this attainment thus: "Know that he who would attain to the Mystical Science, must abandon and be detached from five things: 1. From Creatures. 2. From Temporal things. 3. From the very Gifts of the Holy Spirit. 4. From himself. 5. He must be lost in God. This last is the completest of all, because that Soul only that knows how to be so detached, is that which attains to being lost in God, and thus alone knows how safely to find himself." (Molinos, *Spiritual Guide,* iii, 18.)

One may notice here a curious parallel. The Eastern mystic declares that it is not enough to cease from desire for the feasts of this world. We must also cease to desire the feasts of paradise. The Western mystic tells us that it is not enough for us to be detached from creatures and temporal things. We must be detached from the very gifts of the Holy Spirit. The principle is identical. There must be genuine and disinterested love for the better way; we must seek it for its own sake, not for ours; not that we may have a new kind of enjoyment and satisfaction. This is indeed the strait and narrow gate, which he alone can pass, who is willing to leave himself behind.

We must learn to die to ourselves, before we can rise again to the immortal. There is no concealing the truth that this is a fiercely contested battle, a great and difficult victory. Happy he who fights and conquers, who dies to his own will, that he may rise in the will of the Divine. For "in His will is our peace."

The *Imitation* very beautifully expresses the same teaching: "It is no hard matter to despise human comfort, when we have that which is divine. It is much and very much, to be able to lack both human and divine comfort; and, for God's honour, to be willing cheerfully to endure desolation of heart; and to seek oneself in nothing, nor to regard one's own merit."

What is the sixfold treasure beginning with Peace?

It is this: Peace, Control, Silence, Patience, Faith, One-pointedness.

This description of the sixfold treasure is derived from a beautiful passage in the greatest of the Upanishads, the ancient Sacred Books, on which all later mystical teaching in India rests, drawing therefrom ever new inspiration: "He who knows is therefore full of peace, lord of himself; he has ceased from false gods, he is full of endurance, he intends his will, in his soul he beholds the Soul."

The Bhagavad Gita is full of the same teaching, as, for example, in this verse: "Quietness of heart, amiability, silence, self-control, purity of heart, this is declared to be the true penance of the mind." (xvii, 16.) Molinos has a passage identical in purpose, and almost identical in expression.

"In like manner Resignation is more perfect in these Souls because it springs from the internal and infused Fortitude, which grows as the internal exercise of pure Faith, with Silence and Resignation, is continued." (i, 16.)

Resignation is that ceasing from our own wills and desires, which leaves us free to lose and find ourselves in the will of God. Fortitude, Silence, Faith are three of the six treasures, springing from within, which are the fruit of that great and difficult victory. Until we have won the victory over our hesitation and indecision and cowardice, there can be no peace for us. We are horribly uneasy and restless, weak, vacillating, miserable; almost certainly full of lamentation and complaining. Then comes, through a great effort of courage, the first act of acceptance, of resignation to the will of God; and once we have put ourselves in the line of the divine will, which is our own true will, we find that we have already attained to peace; a peace, divine, passing all understanding, full of healing, full of joy, full of promise of the treasures that are to come.

In the power of that peace, we begin to conquer ourselves. The better in us seeks to master the worse. That in us which feels that in the depths it is at one with the divine will, begins to curb and

subdue the petulance of personal self-will. After long contest, the victory is won; control of the personal self is gained. Henceforth, like a good servant, like a dutiful child, the personal self obeys the deeper self, which seeks only to carry out the will of the divine. A deep and penetrating stillness then fills the whole being, a stillness in which the Soul hears the voice of the divine, and, hearing, knows itself able to endure all things, seeking no heaven and fearing no hell. Then flames forth perfect faith, the divine aspiration which, against all evidence, knows that the Eternal is, and undaunted by the darkness, seeks the Eternal; that faith, which, inwardly divining, the being and will of the Eternal, inspires the will and heart to seek that being and accomplish that will. In the East, this faith has also this more concrete meaning: firm and ardent trust in the Master, the great Initiator who stands above us, and whose love we feel; deep and loving confidence in him, who, having passed on before us, seeks to draw us also on the immortal way. Then we gather ourselves together, and, with whatever there is in us of will and force, we seek to intend our whole being toward the Eternal, toward the Master who reveals to us the Eternal. This is the true one-pointedness, the true concentration, the Sanskrit name of which means, to gather oneself together, and set oneself toward the goal.

In the Bhagavad Gita, the Master thus expresses the true spiritual concentration:

"Hear further My ultimate word, most secret of all; thou are exceeding dear to Me, therefore will I speak what is good for thee.

"Set thy heart on Me, full of love for Me, sacrificing to Me, make obeisance to Me, and thou shalt come to Me; this is truth I promise thee, for thou art dear to Me.

"Putting aside all other duties, come for refuge to Me alone; grieve not, for I shall set thee free from all sins." (xvii, 64-66.)

The Western mystic has given an admirable description of the same treasure, spiritual concentration.

"There are other spiritual men, who have passed beyond the beginning of the Inner Way which leads to Perfection and Union with God, and to which the Lord called them by His infinite Mercy from that Outer Way, in which before they exercised themselves. These men, withdrawn into the inner parts of their Souls, resigning themselves wholly into the Hands of God, having forgotten and despoiled themselves of everything, even of themselves, do always go with an uplifted Spirit into the presence of the Lord, by the means of pure Faith, without Image, Form or Figure, but with great assurance, founded in tranquility and inner rest: in which infused Recollection the spirit gathers itself with such force, that it concentrates thereon the mind, heart, body and all the physical powers." (*Spiritual Guide.*)

Shankara then proceeds to define more precisely each of the Six Treasures. (*To be continued.*)

TWO LETTERS

My Dear Gerard:

YOUR letters have interested me greatly. I have never misunderstood your spirit or your will to help, but the form in which that spirit clothed itself was for some time a barrier. Perhaps it was so intended to teach me to look within the form as we must each one of us learn to look within the circumstances of our lives in order to extract their meaning. Perhaps the sound and somewhat cruel thrashing you gave me was analogous to the method used by the great Teachers themselves—a method learned from the study of life, which drives us so relentlessly along the way of salvation. I realized from the first that I must take it, whatever it might mean, and extract its good. But the good has taken many aspects. It is hard for me to write of these things which are so intimate, even to you, but I am going to test my own disinterestedness and desire to serve by doing so. Do you remember how we used to tear off the outer coats of bulbs and seedlings to get at the hidden principle which made them live? Times have changed for us only in the form of our absorbing interest. "Now souls are bared that men may see the way to grow." So in the service of that Master whom we both adore I strip off my wrappings and lay myself bare before you.

You remember that since you began to write you have said many harsh things about me. You have told me I was emotionally hysterical and spiritually paralysed, that I was self-deluded, hypocritical, poisoned by vanity, jealousy, and self-will, and have ended by saying that you wanted to shake me. This, I think, is the substance of your accusation. The additional epithets and illustrations I mercifully omit. Well, my first thought on reading all these things was one of horror. Was I, could I be unconsciously to myself, so vile a creature? I sat down quaking to think it over, so that I might by walking another path, perchance, save myself from destruction. "Yes, he is quite right," I concluded. I am, I must be self-deluded and a hypocrite, being human. And being human, probably do not know to what extent. Yes, I am vain, too. I do think of myself as doing things and see myself in them. But was it not unjust to accuse me of not serving through love of a Master who was only known to me by his image as I had seen it in a mirror? How could more be expected of me than that I should follow that image, blindly as I did, till coming with a heavy thud against the mirror I saw that it was only an image. Then I felt the Master's hand upon me, so I turned and saw him standing on the other side. At least I should never have sought the reality had I not stupidly, perhaps, but with the help of that self-will which you find so perverse in me,

doggedly followed the reflection. And jealous? Well, it was a fault I despised. I had hoped that my own severe, persistent discipline had before this knocked every vestige of it out of me. But, of course, I was not the best judge, and I prided myself on being fair.

At this point a wave of indignation swept over me utterly destroying the memory of your penetrating sympathy and the inspiration I had drawn from your kind, brave effort to help. Who is he, I thought, that he should expose me to the light with brutal cruelty? How does his action differ, essentially, from the harsh judgments and personal attacks which have so often served to throw off those who were guilty of them from contact with things of the spirit? If I am self-deluded and a hypocrite, vain, jealous, and self-willed what shall be said of him? How can love or even friendship express itself, most of all spiritually, against such a blighting hail of hostile criticism? Is brotherhood and toleration a mere form of words among us? Something is wrong here, I said, and I must find it.

Just to think of your action as failure in brotherly love and toleration, which it had at first seemed, was too simple an explanation. I knew of your long years of experience, your struggles and sacrifices, your real spiritual attainments, how you had turned personal loss into gain for others, and I saw that could not be.

Then I remembered the hot fire of discipleship: how it consumes and melts, how it continually drives out to the surface all faults, all weaknesses even, which have been left alive. The snake of self—scotched—not killed—gone inward too soon—the preliminary work not finished. But this theory was not altogether satisfactory either. The snake was too large. It would have destroyed you in its infancy—such a one.

So I stopped and thought again. I looked beneath the surface and then it came—the paradox—good inside of evil. You were trying to help me spiritually by awaking me, roughly enough, to faults of which I was, in my self-satisfaction, unconscious. I remembered the bitter taste of certain very curative pills, and, with a sigh for the sugar coats omitted, burst into a laugh.

Evidently I had misread the label of these particular pills. "Poison," I had read, "slow acting but of high destructive power." "Cure for conceit" it was this time. "Taken in small doses produces humility. An over dose will bring on depression." Well, I took one hoping to become suddenly the little child, but alas, I must have again misread the label. I began at once to congratulate myself on the fair-mindedness which had made it possible for me to find your meaning and to assure myself that I would never in like circumstances stoop to the methods you employed. This did not look much like humility, so I concluded that I had not yet deciphered this mysterious label correctly.

"Non-resistance," I thought tentatively, as I looked again. The disciple has no rights save that of trial. So I tried not answering back. It was at this time that you expected to hear from me and were disappointed because you didn't. I thought if I could be brought as a lamb to the slaughter—dumb—I might wake up some morning and find myself Christlike, all of a sudden without further effort, and guaranteed to last.

Well, though it was clear enough by this time that those pills were no cure for conceit, I began to realize how badly I needed that cure. No sooner did this idea take possession of me than I rushed post-haste to my room, packed my gladstone, and took the next train east to see a disciple whom I had once met at a theosophical convention. He had been haunting me ever since. Now I knew why. It wasn't anything that he had said about anything in particular. He just was it. It is hard for me to explain exactly, but I'm sure you will understand. Of course I did not tell him I had come to get humility from him. He would have said he had none, and didn't know what I meant. I just talked with him about all sorts of things and he thought I was interested. Then I asked him to go with me for a walking trip, and he did. Oh, how I drank it in. I spent three weeks on a farm with some sheep. I tended them and made them love me so that they came very, very close; and their simple, selfless faces became part of my consciousness. Then I went home and took up my business.

Don't you see the point, yet—my friend? We—some of us—are little ones, and a millstone around the neck and to be cast into the sea is better than to offend one of us or cause us to offend. "But discipline," I hear you say. Yes, for that, too, I have an answer. "It must needs be that offenses must come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh." We are little ones, yes, but we are not any of us so little as we were. We have grown, to be sure, just a hair's breadth, but still grown, and that hair line makes all the difference between the drive and the draw. You can no longer drive us into the Kingdom. When you try it we say "No, the Kingdom is not over there." But you can draw us. And for this was love given, and friendship, and beauty, and faith, and obedience, too, if you wish. Don't you see that all your driving hardly pushed me a step forward on the path you wanted me to go?—tripped me up, really, so that I fell in the opposite direction,—but that the wonderful, unconscious power of just being did draw me toward itself and yet never knew it had done anything?

And now, my friend, don't take this letter too hard. Above all don't forget that I am grateful, very grateful for the interest and good will that prompted you to write. Sit down and tell me now how you see it all, and where you think I have been wrong. If my doctor hadn't exiled me to this lonely place I would drop in on you some evening and

talk it over. I hope that my health will soon permit me to return to civilization. But for the present I must be satisfied to write. And remember, my friend, whatever happens there can never be such a thing as a misunderstanding between us. For the love of our hearts is one, and the purpose of our lives the same—to be each a plank in the bridge which shall span the gap that separates this world from the other. By our lives laid down must the bridge be built. But the pain of the axe is forgotten, we both know, when we feel the step of the Master, and know that we are helping him to reach and save his own.

Faithfully yours,

MYRON S. CRAIGHEAD.

To MR. MYRON S. CRAIGHEAD.

DEAR SIR: The Editor the THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY has sent me your letter, telling me that you have requested its publication together with whatever response I may be able to make to it, and assuring me that it is your expressed wish, no less than his own, that that response be as direct and frank as possible.

I confess that were it not for the Editor's urging, and the explicit nature of the assurance he has conveyed to me from you, I should not wish to attempt any reply to what you have written, much less to make of the pages of the QUARTERLY the medium of its expression. Yet it well may be that certain of the misconceptions your letter evidences are shared by others, and that it will be helpful to discuss them openly. So, though I find difficulty in believing that you actually desire my comments, I shall do my best to take you at your word, and, having read your letter, "sit down and tell you now how I see it all and where I think you have been wrong."

First, you are wrong in assuming that you know me. To you I am utterly unknown, save as a name and as the writer of certain letters which you have read as they appeared in print. And, second, you are wrong in assuming that these letters were in any way directed to you or written for or at you. Published in the hope that they might provide useful food for self-questioning and for thought, they were originally precisely what their title indicated, "Letters to Friends," written to some of those to whom I am not unknown, who had imposed in me the trust of friendship, and who had asked me, in ways which could not be denied, for such light as I could throw upon dark places in their lives.

To you, to whom these letters were not written, but who have so strangely taken them to yourself, their light has seemed but added darkness, and you tell me they have been as a stumbling block in your path. I regret that this should have been so. But the way is clear on either

side, and they are in your path only as you yourself place them there. For surely their publication does not compel you to concern yourself with them, or with their author,—still less to take them as directed to yourself.

It is this last assumption which I trust may repay analysis. What is it that led you to take personally what was so wholly impersonal to you? What are the underlying causes, the states of mind and heart which generate them? Or what the truth which these reflect even while distorting? For we can have no clear vision of any fault or misconception until we see it as the perversion of a virtue and a truth.

In the light of the theosophical philosophy it should not be difficult for us to see the virtue which is here operative or the truth upon which that virtue rests. Life is one. All that we can see about us, in the great world in which we live, has its correspondence in ourselves. We are not set over against a strange and hostile universe, but are in literal truth one with it,—containing in ourselves all that it contains of good and evil, wisdom and folly, power and weakness, majesty and degradation. And, if we are to mount by the steps of self-conquest to the heights of which our lives are capable, we have to learn to face and to know these qualities of our nature, by which and upon which we are to climb. Therefore we do well to turn back upon the darkness of our own hearts all the light we can gain from without, and, in this sense, take all things personally.

To do this, wholly and completely, is to "kill out all sense of separateness," or as the notes of *Light on the Path* have phrased it, no longer to "fancy that you can stand aside from the bad man or the foolish man. They are yourself, though in a less degree than your friend or your Master . . . the sin and shame of the world are your sin and shame; for you are part of it; your Karma is inextricably interwoven with the great Karma and before you can attain knowledge you must have passed through all places, foul and clean alike."

To gain knowledge, therefore, we have to learn to see ourselves in both the evil and the good about us: to see the evil and the good of others to be in us as it is in them. Only as we do so can we gain the power to conquer ourselves or to help our friends; for it is only as we have seen and faced an evil in our own hearts, and begun its conquest there, that we can see and face it in the hearts of others. In this sense, as I said before, we have to take all things personally and to ourselves.

It is in this sense, also, that these "Letters to Friends" have been taken personally by many readers who have written me upon them. I have before me, for example, one, of which I know no more than that it was written from a great Paris hospital and bears on its face the pathetic evidences of weary heart and mind and body, yet tells of the writer's gratitude that there are those who understand what he has felt

and the inner conflict he has so long been blindly waging and believed he waged alone. There are many other letters such as his which the Editor has forwarded me—and all of them tell of the writers' recognition of themselves in what they have read. Some, indeed, forgetting that what is most intimate and personal is also most universal, assume, as you have done, that in some strange way I must have known them and have written peculiarly and specially for them.

It is this assumption of peculiarity and specialness which causes the initial perversion of the truth, and which leads us back into a doubly dangerous form of the heresy of separateness—the heresy from which the truth itself would free us. Let us trace its steps. There comes to us some voice of truth, some message spoken from the depths of a man's heart to the heart of his friend, telling of the evil with which that heart contends, and speaking, however clumsily and brokenly, of the eternal warfare which the soul must wage. And because these words come from the depths and are spoken to the depths, the soul, which dwells in the depths, knows that they are of itself and for itself and that they tell of the battle which it too must fight. If the mind can share this inner recognition all is well. But often the mind cannot or will not share it. It has little liking for the warfare of the soul, small desire to face what lies covered in the dark places of the heart. It still fancies it can stand separate and aloof from the sin and shame it sees about it, and blinds its eyes to that which presses on it from within. And yet it feels this pressure, which, like water rising behind a dam, grows as it is resisted; or, like gas gathering in an ulcer, renders all about it the more sore and sensitive the longer it is confined, till there comes a time when the lightest touch is scarcely to be borne. The touch of reality is not always light. The cure for our pain is not in the diminution of the pressure, but rather in its intensification until that which confines it is swept aside. And when the soul stirs in answer to this inner recognition, the mind feels its added pressure. Could we open ourselves to it, take it to ourselves and assimilate it, relief would come. But if the mind be still fixed in resistance, it is led in self-defense to ascribe to the deliberate intent of the speaker the sense, which presses on it from within, of the intimate application of his words.

Paradoxical as it may appear, it is nevertheless a truth that the reason we believe others to be talking at us is, if not mere vanity, because we are unwilling to take to ourselves that which they say; because our minds are set upon the denial of that which our souls accept, and because, clinging to the heresy of separateness, we would here isolate ourselves from the great life about us, and postpone the stern and vital conflicts which sooner or later we know we shall have to face.

I think, if you will reread your letter, you will see how much of this unconscious attitude it reflects. You speak of being driven relentlessly

along the way of salvation. Yet no other thing can drive you than the will of your own soul—and this will is yourself. Recognize it as such—shift but for a moment your sense of self-identification from the personality to the Soul, and all this, which now seems to you a compulsion imposed from without, will be seen as but the movement of your own free-will toward the fulfilment of its desire.

You thought that I had called you vain, jealous, spiritually paralysed and self-deluded, as well as many other evil things—because I wrote of the need of conquering these. But have you no need to conquer them? Are these great enduring enemies, with which the soul wages its warfare till it has gained for itself their strength, absent from your heart, yet rife in all other hearts? Surely you do not think so, nor believe that the soul is vile because it must contend with vileness. Must not the whole nature of man be used wisely by the one who desires to enter the way? Are not all steps necessary to make up the ladder and do not the vices of men become steps in the ladder, one by one, as they are surmounted? Why "sit down quaking" before the contemplation of that by which you can climb?

Were your goal that of the man or woman of the world such an attitude would not be unnatural. To them life is static: their aim not one of endless progress but rather to maintain a certain level they feel that they have reached and with which they are content. Shake that content by showing them a fault unconquered, or a virtue ungained, and they feel, and feel truly, that you are thwarting the fulfilment of their desire and so resent your action as an injury. But your letter speaks of discipleship, and the attitude of the disciple must be wholly the reverse of this. His goal is no fixed level, however exalted. It is always above and beyond him. He is neither content with what he has attained nor seeks content; but striving always toward a life of more effective service and more intimate union, seeks to remove all that separates him from it.

That he is separated from it is evident to him, and he asks himself what it is that stands between. He is what he is; he has attained what he has,—so much and no more; and this is not enough. He is like a man whose business has paid him dividends for many years, but has not brought him the return he desires and believes that it should yield. He calls experts to his assistance and takes counsel with his friends. Together they examine anew each department, seeking for waste and extravagance, for ineffective methods, useful in their day but now no longer suited to their end. Were no fault discovered, no neglected opportunity revealed, it would be clear to that man that he could hope for nothing more than was already his. But whatever fault is found is welcomed, for it is seen that as it is corrected greater returns can be gained.

This seems to me a true picture of what must always be the disciple's

attitude. Recognizing his personality "as not himself, but that thing which he has with pain created for his own use," he must examine and re-examine it, seeking for fault and ways of bettering it, and he who would help him to his heart's desire must help him in this search.

You see with the disciple it is not a matter of being driven relentlessly along the pathway of salvation. It is rather a matter of his own burning, ardent desire to draw nearer to his Master, to surmount all that stands between, to conquer every power and quality of nature till he enlists it in that Master's service. It is this desire which makes of him a disciple, which is recognized in him by all his co-disciples—by all his comrades in the battle he is fighting. It must be presupposed if we are to understand anything of what is written for disciples.

Furthermore, there can be in the disciple no hint or suggestion of self-pity. He does not desire gentler treatment or easier methods—though this may sometimes be the plea of those who have not yet entered upon the Path in earnest. Disciples have their hall-marks by which they may be known. This is one. For the disciple is not *made,* he *becomes.*

With your final point I quite agree. Those help us most who draw us by the mere power of what they are. Only to the degree that men are can they either do or understand. It is so the Master draws us; and if we can but keep our gaze fixed on him it is enough. But to most men there come times when they can neither see nor hear for the press of foes around them and the blinding dust of battle. Then it is that a comrade's sword may be of help, and a guiding touch from one beside them lead to an open way.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN GERARD.

If knowledge without religion were highly valuable, nothing would be more so than the Devil.

PERSIAN APHORISM.

THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS

"Few phenomena are more striking than the change that has come over educated Protestant opinion in its estimate of monasticism. The older Protestantism uncompromisingly judged the monastic ideal and life to be both unchristian and unnatural, an absolute perversion deserving nothing but condemnation. But now the view of the critico-historical school of Protestant thought, of which Dr. Adolf Harnack is so representative a spokesman, is that the preservation of spiritual religion in Catholic Christianity, both Eastern and Western, has been mainly, if not wholly, due to Monasticism."

(*Encyclopedia Brittanica.*)

THE earliest organized peoples of which we have knowledge had their monks and nuns, for Monasticism has its roots in certain fundamental needs of human nature and its origin is lost in the mists of time. Men soon learned that if they wished to live a religious life they must flee from the temptations and allurements of the world. Hence the tendency to an eremitical life, as shown by the hermits of Egypt and Syria in the early days of Christianity. But they also learned that to imitate others who had the same ideals, was a powerful and needed stimulant. Just as "evil communications corrupt good manners," so "Saints beget saintliness," therefore the early hermits soon gravitated together and began to live their lives in common. The monastery combines these two inherent tendencies; retirement from the world, solitude, austerity; with a community life and a fellowship of worship.

There is a higher ideal. It is not *necessary* to flee from the world, the flesh and the devil, in order to become a saint, but it is easier. It *is* necessary to forego these things, to renounce pleasure, to conquer pain, to turn the desires of the heart towards God, so that the mainsprings of all action and thought are the love and the service of the Master. But this can be and is done by a few strong souls while living in the world and continuing to perform all secular duties. There is a discipline of the spirit and an asceticism of the heart, which are even more effective than corporal austerities.

Wherever men or women live together, for any purpose whatsoever, order, discipline, organization, rules, are necessary. The religious community is no exception to this law, and each great religion has had its institutions, which have varied much in external object and internal rule and government, but which all have had the same fundamental purpose,—the union of the individual with God.

The *Catholic Encyclopedia* says: "It must be clearly understood that, in the case of the monk, asceticism is not an end in itself. For him, as for all men, the end of life is to love God. Monastic asceticism then means the removal of obstacles to loving God, and what these obstacles are is clear from the nature of love itself. Love is the union of wills. If the creature is to love God, he can do it in one way only; by sinking his own will in God's; by doing the will of God in all things: 'If ye love Me keep my commandments.' No one understands better than the monk those words of the beloved disciple, 'Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life'; for in his case life has come to mean renunciation. Broadly speaking this renunciation has three great branches corresponding to the three evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity and obedience."

The purpose of this article is to give a very brief account of the more famous Religious Orders in Christianity, with the date of their foundation and the name of their founder.

Almost everyone knows that the Benedictines were founded by St. Benedict in the early centuries of the Christian Era; that the Franciscans and Dominicans were founded by St. Francis of Assisi and St. Dominic respectively, in the early Middle Ages; that Ignatius Loyola founded the Jesuits, somewhat later. People also know in a vague sort of way that there are many other important Orders, and if they stop and think they can name the Carmelites, the Cistercians, the Augustinians, the Trappists and perhaps several others, but if asked who founded these other orders in most cases they would be forced to confess complete ignorance.

Few persons know that there are nearly seventy of these Religious Orders which have been recognized officially by the Roman Catholic Church. An effigy of each founder is placed in a series of seventy-two niches which surround the great dome of St. Peters of Rome, and these niches are almost full.

In order to make clear what follows, some definition of terms is desirable.

Monks are men who live a religious life for its own sake; external works, either temporal or spiritual are accidental; clericature or ordination is an addition, an accession and no part of their object. Until well on in the Middle Ages monks were rarely priests. They live and die in the monastery of their profession and are a part of it.

Friars are men who adopt a religious life because it is a means to enable them better to carry out some ideal of action, to succor the poor, convert the heathen, transform the heretic, preach the gospel, nurse the sick, or imitate the outer life of Christ in the doing of all these things. They belong to the Order as a whole and not to any part of it, and may be and are moved about, freely, from place to place wherever their services are needed. They may or may not be priests.

Canons, or more accurately, *Canons Regular,* are clerics with distinct ecclesiastical or parochial duties, who live a community life under a Rule, in order better to perform their work.

Clerics Regular, a term which arose in the 16th century, are priests, first of all, even in dress and mode of life. They undertake all the duties suitable to priests and attend to the spiritual necessities of their neighbours, especially the education of the young, which the Mendicant Orders never attempted. Being Clerks and not Canons, they escaped the inconvenience of a title of dignity and of being bound to a particular Church. The Jesuits are Clerics Regular.

There are three kinds of religious life as exemplified in the different Orders; the purely contemplative life where the monks devote themselves to union with God in a life of solitude and retirement, such as the Carthusians and Trappists; the active Orders, the members of which expend their energies in doing good to men; and the mixed Orders, where the character of the outer work is spiritual in its object and requires contemplation for its attainment; such as preaching and higher education.

The rules of St. Basil (still used by practically all Eastern monks) and of St. Benedict were as suitable for women as for men, because in those days it was not contemplated that monks should be priests; hence the feminine equivalent of the monk—the nun. But the rules of the Mendicant Orders, and especially the Clerics Regular, were not suitable for women, so St. Francis wrote a special rule for his "Second Order," and other founders followed suit. There are Orders for women whose origin is independent of any Order for men. This is especially so in more recent years. The Sisters of the Visitation and the Ursulines are noteworthy examples.

There are usually "Third" Orders connected with any institution having a "Second" Order, but by no means all Orders have the "Second" and "Third" Orders. There are no Benedictine or Jesuit Tertiaries and the Jesuit Rule expressly forbids nuns.

There are other types of religious associations than the Orders; the more famous are called Congregations because, not complying with the essential conditions, they could not be called Orders. Such is the Congregation of the Oratory, founded by St. Philip Neri in 1575. It is an association of priests not bound by vows. The Lazarists, founded by St. Vincent de Paul in 1655, is a Congregation and not an Order. Sometimes the only distinction between a Congregation and an Order is in the solemnity of the vows. In an Order they must be perpetual. In a Congregation the vows, when there are any, are renewed from time to time, and at the end of any period the member is free to return to the world. Such are the Daughters of St. Vincent de Paul, the White Sisters, and the Sisters of Charity.

As has already been set forth in an article in the QUARTERLY,* the first of the great Western Orders was the *Benedictine,* founded by St. Benedict at Subiaco, near Rome, about the year 500 A. D. Later he moved to Mount Cassino, which has remained the center of the Order. The Benedictines served as a pattern upon which all subsequent Orders have been modeled, and St. Benedict's famous Rule is the basis of nearly all subsequent religious Rules. It is still one of the most numerous, powerful and beneficial of religious institutions. The monks wear a black habit, live in partial seclusion and devote themselves largely to a purely religious life, but from the earliest times, the education of children has been the recognized and principal work of the Order. Its monasteries were the preserver of letters and learning during the so-called Dark Ages, and it is to the Benedictines that we owe the existence of most of the classical and ecclesiastical writings of Latin antiquity.

St. Augustine and his companions, on the famous missionary trip to England, were Benedictines, and so was the Venerable Bede. There were many reforms and revivals within the main Order. The most famous of these were the Cluniac Movement in 910 and the Cistercian in 1098. The general tendency of these revivals was in the direction of greater austerity of life and a closer adherence to St. Benedict's original rule. The last great revival is known as the Tridentine movement which occurred in the 17th Century.

The Reformation, the Religious wars and the French Revolution spread havoc among the Benedictines, so that at the beginning of the 19th Century it is said that only thirty houses survived, but the second half of the century witnessed a series of remarkable revivals and now there are two vigorous congregations in the United States, thirty in Austria-Hungary and Switzerland, five in England, with several branches of foreign congregations. The two original monasteries of St. Benedict, at Subiaco and Mount Cassino, are flourishing; but in France, Spain, other parts of Italy and in South America there are only a few weak remnants of this former great Order. These have not yet felt the vivifying influence of the recent revival, though signs are not wanting that it will soon reach them.

The chief outer work of the Benedictines in the present day is secondary education. There are 1,121 schools, or gymnasia, attached to the abbeys where the monks teach 12,000 boys; many of the nunneries also teach girls. Where there is a dearth of secular priests the monks often do ordinary parochial work.

There are about 11,000 Benedictine monks at the present time and the same number of nuns. An Anglican offshoot of the Order has recently been started in England, at Caldey in Wales, on the original lines, and an effort is now being made by High Church Episcopalians in the United States to start a foundation here.

* The THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY for July, 1909.

The first great and successful effort to reform the Benedictine Order is known as the Cluniac revival. The *Order of Cluniac Benedictines* was founded at Cluny, a town of East Central France, near Macon, in 910 by William the Pious, Count of Auvergne. The first Abbot was Berno, who did little. Under the second, the great Odo, who was armed by papal powers and privileges, Cluny became the center of a powerful movement for reform, which spread all over France, and then beyond its borders. Even the parent houses of Subiaco and Mount Cassino received the reform and adopted the Cluny manner of life.

They gave up all field work and manual work, greatly lengthened the canonical offices, until the services came to occupy nearly the entire day. The daily psalmody exceeded a hundred psalms. The great influence of the Order, however, was in its method of government. The Benedictine monasteries had always been autonomous bodies with only a very loose tie to any central organization. In the Cluniac Order, however, every house was subject to Cluny and the Abbot of Cluny was the "General" of the whole Order. He appointed and dismissed the superiors of the subject houses, usually priors, not abbots, and every member of the Order was professed by his permission.

The greatness of Cluny was chiefly due to the personal greatness of its Abbots. For 250 years, seven wonderful men ruled its destinies, taking part in all great movements in Church and State; refusing any personal preferment, they were second only to the Pope himself, in power and influence. Their monastery at Cluny was gigantic, and their Church the largest in Christendom until the building of St. Peter's at Rome.

Beginning with the death of the last great Abbot, Peter the Venerable, in 1157, the Cluniacs rapidly declined in importance; the order was distracted by quarrels and rivalries, by the jealousy of sub-houses in foreign countries, until finally in 1790 it was dissolved and suppressed and the parent Church at Cluny deliberately destroyed.

The *Carthusians,* who wear a white habit, were founded by St. Bruno in 1084. With six companions, he asked the Bishop of Grenoble for a place in which he and his companions could devote themselves to a religious life. The Bishop gave them a wild and remote tract of land in the Savoy Alps, where they settled and where the Order has had its headquarters ever since.

It is the most austere of all the Orders. The monks live in separate houses, eat once a day, never touch meat, even in illness, meet three times a day, for the Midnight office, for High Mass at noon, and for Vespers. The rest of the time they live in their little houses, each occupying himself with his garden, or his carpenter work, or with his private devotions. On Sundays and feast days they have their single meal together, in the refectory, and once a week they go outside the

enclosure for a walk together. The austerity of the Order prevented its rapid or great increase.

At the beginning of the 18th century there were 170 charterhouses, 75 in France, all being subject to the Grande Chartreuse. This famous monastery has been the habitat of the head of the Order since the days of St. Bruno, and has had a remarkably uneventful career. Save for a few years during and after the French Revolution, and since 1901, when the property was seized and the monks turned out by the French Government, the monks have been there for 800 years.

This Order is unique in that it has never been reformed; "never reformed because never deformed." The monks to this day live exactly as did St. Bruno and his six companions. The famous old Charterhouse of London, long a school, and now a hospital for pensioners, was a Carthusian monastery until suppressed by Henry VIII. There were twenty charterhouses before the recent expulsion from France. The community of the Grande Chartreuse, consisting of forty choir monks and twenty lay brothers, moved to the monastery of the Order near Lucca in Italy. There is one house in England, founded in 1883, and made up mostly of foreigners, including many of those recently expelled from France.

The liqueur known as Chartreuse, made by the lay-brothers, at the Grande Chartreuse, has given the Order an unenviable fame. It may not be amiss to add, therefore, that at the Restoration, after the Revolution, the monks recovered only a barren wilderness, and for it they had to pay rent. Until they invented the liqueur they were in want of the actual means of subsistence. Since then they have used their income first to restore their monastery, then to found branch charterhouses elsewhere, but by far the largest part has been devoted to charitable purposes in France and all over the world. They do not permit the money to accumulate, and it is certain that the possession of the income has "made no difference at all to the secluded and austere life of the monks of the Grande Chartreuse" (*Enc. Brit.*)

The *Cistercians* were started in 1098 by St. Robert, a Benedictine monk who was not satisfied with the laxities which had crept into the Order in his day. With twenty monks he migrated to a swampy desert called The Valley of Wormwood, near Dijon. Here he founded the famous Monastery of Citeaux. He was forced by the Pope to return to his former monastery, but he was succeeded at Citeaux first by Alberic, then by the famous English St. Stephen Harding. The young community had a hard struggle for existence for many years, but before the end of Stephen's abbacy in 1134 there were over thirty Cistercian houses.

In 1112 the great St. Bernard and thirty others offered themselves to the monastery and this started a wonderful development. When Bernard died in 1154 there were 280 houses; by the end of the century over 500. The monks wear a grey or white habit with a black scapular.

The keynote of their life is a literal observance of St. Benedict's Rule, especially including a return to field work and manual labour. To give time for this they cut away the accretions to the several services which had been steadily growing since St. Benedict's time. They were the great farmers and horse and cattle breeders of the later Middle Ages, and are considered to have had a marked effect upon civilization by the many improvements in farming operations which they introduced and propagated. To take care of this increasing work, the system of lay-brothers arose, usually peasants or men of low extraction and without education, who lived alongside the choir monks, and who took no part in the canonical office, but had a fixed round of prayer and observances of their own.

The Order prospered for two to three hundred years, when there were 750 houses, but then it gradually declined, partly because of the influence of the Reformation, the Religious Wars and the French Revolution; partly because of the rise of the Mendicant Orders, which proved strong competitors and supplied the needs of the age, and partly because, being itself a reform, the inevitable laxity which crept in in time, struck at the very reason of its existence. Many efforts were made to reform it from within. The Trappists are a reformed offshoot, started by de Rancé in 1663. The Bernardines are another named after the greatest abbot of the Order.

The Cistercians now have about 100 monasteries with 2,500 monks and 2,000 lay-brothers. Over half of these are Trappists, and a great majority of the Order are in Austria-Hungary.

There have always been a large number of Cistercian nuns, devoted to contemplation and field work. At the period of their widest extension there are said to have been 900 nunneries. At the present time there are 100 nunneries with 3,000 nuns, choir and lay, of which 15 nunneries and 900 nuns are Trappists.

The order was once powerful and popular in England but did not survive the suppression of the monasteries in the reign of Henry the VIII. Tintern was a Cistercian Abbey.

Silverstrines or *Sylvestrines* were founded by Silvester Gozzolini in 1231 and approved by Innocent IV in 1247. They are an offshoot of the Benedictines with specially severe rules concerning poverty. In 1907 there were eleven Silvestrine monasteries with 60 choir monks. The habit is blue.

The *Celestines* were founded by Peter Marone in 1260, who afterwards became Pope Celestine V. They are also an offshoot of the Benedictines. Celestine endeavored, with some success during his lifetime, to graft his more severe rules upon the Benedictines. The order never was very large and died out entirely in the 18th and 19th centuries. The habit was black.

The *Olivetans,* another offshoot of the Benedictines, were founded

in 1313 by St. Bernard Tolomei, at Accone, near Siena. The habit is white. They use the rule of St. Benedict, with some added severities, but have a government patterned on that of the Mendicant Orders. There is a house in Rome and a few others, containing about 125 monks.

The *Trinitarians,* are Canons Regular, wear a white habit with a red and blue cross on the breast, and were founded in 1198 by St. John of Malta and St. Felix of Valois, for the liberation of Christian prisoners and slaves from captivity under Moors and Saracens. If necessary they were to offer themselves in exchange for captives, but usually redeemed the prisoners with money raised for the purpose. At one time there were several hundred houses. In the 17th century a reform movement started called the Barefooted Trinitarians, which became a distinct Order and is the only one that survives. It has 500 members and ransoms negro slaves in Africa.

The *Franciscans,* perhaps with the exception of the Jesuits, are the best known of all the Orders; and are the first of the four great Mendicant Orders. Sometimes they are called Friars Minor, or Minorites, also the "Seraphic Order"; and in England Grey Friars (although their habit is brown rather than grey). The Order was founded by St. Francis of Assisi in 1209, with the reluctant assent of Innocent III. There were only twelve when they obtained official recognition. The Benedictines gave them the use of the little Chapel of St. Mary of the Angels, called the Portiuncula, which became the cradle and headquarters of the Order.

The keynote of the Order was the imitation of the public life of Christ, especially his poverty. They were to earn their daily bread and only if unable to earn bread were they to beg. They were forbidden any possessions, made no store for the morrow, could own no land, accumulate no capital and were forbidden to receive or handle money. No other austerities were imposed. As they had to eat what was laid before them, there were no restrictions as to meat, save the regular fast days of the Church.

Their mission was to preach the Kingdom of God to the lowly, the outcast and the leper. They were to sleep wherever they happened to be, in barns, hedgerows or the porches of Churches.

St. Francis's original conception was thus entirely distinct from the monastic ideal of the Benedictines. There was no novitiate, no organization. The number of members increased with such great rapidity and spread into such distant places, that it became impossible for all the friars to attend the annual chapter at Assisi, and the Church authorities saw that systematic organization was necessary.

It is a moot point how far St. Francis himself saw and was reconciled to the inevitable. According to Sabatier, the change was forced upon him and almost broke his heart. According to other and more recognized historians, while he regretted the early days of simplicity and

strict observance, he realized that the methods of this time were impracticable for such great and widely separated numbers. Howbeit, in 1220, Honorius III by a formal bull, approved the *Order of Friars Minor,* decreed that a year's novitiate should be required and that after profession it was not lawful to leave the Order. At the next General Chapter St. Francis resigned the post of General, appointed a Vicar, and had little thereafter to do with the government of the Order. He died in 1226. Immediately the Order divided into those who wished to follow St. Francis's simple ideal and protested against turning it into a systematic Order, called Zealots or Spirituals, and the Moderates who wished a mitigation of the strictness of the rule, especially where it came to the owning of property, like churches and monasteries. In 1230 Gregory IX decreed that as St. Francis's Rule and Testament had never received the sanction of the General Chapter, it was not binding and he allowed trustees to hold and administer money for the Order.

Elias, who headed the Moderates, was elected General in 1232. His rule was despotic and tyrannical and his private life was lax according to Franciscan standards. He was deposed in 1239.

The Zealots were greatly in the minority but included nearly all of St. Francis's early disciples. They were grievously persecuted under Elias. Brother Leo was scourged and Brother Bernard, the first disciple, was hunted for a year like a wild beast, in the mountains to which he had fled for hiding. The dissensions increased in virility and bitterness, even the generalship of St. Bonaventura (1257-1274) being unable to reconcile the conflicting parties. In 1370 arose the *Observant* reform. They wished to make a "poor and scanty use" of worldly good, instead of the "moderate use" advocated by those of less strict views. In an effort to put a stop to this internal warfare in 1517, Pope Leo X divided the Order into two separate and independent bodies, one the *Conventuals,* who were allowed to use all the papal dispensations in regard to owning and holding property, and, the *Observants,* who were bound to as close an observance of St. Francis's Rule as was practically possible. A great number of the Conventuals went over to the Observants, who, ever since have remained much the most numerous and influential branch of the Order.

There were many other reforms. One of the chief of these was called *Alcantarines,* after its leader, St. Peter of Alcantara, St. Theresa's great friend, who died in 1562. The *Capuchins* arose in the early part of the 16th century, and were made a separate order in 1619. They are described further on.

In spite of these troubles and internal dissentions, the Franciscans increased steadily in power, numbers and usefulness. They have always been the most numerous of the Religious Orders. At the time of the Reformation there were 100,000 friars. At the present time there are 15,000 Observants, 1,500 Conventuals and 9.500 Capuchins.

Mostly recruited from among the poor, the Franciscans have always been especially the Order to work for and with the poor. Another great work has been their missionary labours, especially with the Mohammedans, Chinese and Japanese. They have also, however, held their own in the Universities, and have their school of theology which carries on the Platonism of the Early Fathers, as rival to the Aristotelianism of the Dominican School. Roger Bacon was a Franciscan friar.

The Franciscans early developed a First, Second and Third Order. The first was for the friars, the second for the nuns, and the third, Tertiaries, for the lay-members, whether men or women, who desired to live a religious life, but could not leave their families or secular duties, and take the full vows of poverty, chastity and obedience.

The Second Order, for nuns, called the *Poor Clares,* after their foundress St. Clare, St. Francis's life long and most devoted friend and follower, was formed very early in St. Francis's career. St. Clare was professed by St. Francis in 1212. Two years later, she and her companions were established in the convent of St. Damian at Assisi. At first St. Francis's personal example seemed to be all the rule the nuns required, but in 1219 while St. Francis was on his missionary journey to the East, Cardinal Hugolino made for and imposed on them a rule which was only a kind of severe Benedictine observance, leaving out the special characteristics of St. Francis's ideal. St. Clare made it the object of her life to have this changed and only succeeded, partially in 1247, when what is known as the "Second Rule" was approved, and finally in the year of her death, 1253, when the "Third Rule" gave her what she wanted. This is the "Rule of the Clares." It is one of great poverty, austerity and seclusion. Most of the convents adopted it, but some clung to that of 1247. In the interests of conformity St. Bonaventura, in 1264, obtained papal permission to modify the strictness of the rule of 1253. Only a few adopted it, many more clinging to that of 1253. In 1400, under the leadership of St. Colette, a reform to greater strictness, called *Coletines,* was started and most Franciscan nuns now belong to this reform. There are, therefore, some six or more different observances among Franciscan nuns, who are and always have been very numerous. There are now about 150 Convents of the several observances in every part of the world.

Tertiaries are "Associations of lay folk" in connection with the Mendicant Orders. Since the 8th century it was not unusual for the monasteries to have confraternities of lay men and women associated with them, but it remained for St. Francis to draw up a rule for his lay followers and thus to found a regular institution. This was done about 1221. At first they were called "The Brothers and Sisters of Penance," but a little later, when the nuns became the "Second Order," the Order of Penance became the "Third Order of St. Francis"; whence the name Tertiaries. The original rule prescribes severe simplicity of dress and of

life; certain abstinences and prayers and other religious exercises; forbids the frequentation of the theatre; the bearing of arms, and the taking of oaths save when administered by a magistrate. It is astonishingly like the life taught by George Fox in England 400 years later. In 1289 Nicholas IV approved the rule with slight modifications and it has remained in force until the present day.

The Third Order spread with incredible rapidity throughout Europe and embraced multitudes of men and women in all walks of life. It remained under the control of the Friars Minor.

In time a tendency set in for numbers of the Third Order to live together. Regular congregations were formed of those who took vows and lived a fully organized religious life, based on the Rule of the Third Order, with some supplementary regulations. These are the "Regular Tertiaries" as distinct from the "Secular Tertiaries" who continued to live in the world.

The other Mendicant Orders all formed Third orders, but the Franciscan Third Order has always been the principal one.

In 1883 Leo the XIII recast the rule, making it more suitable for modern requirements. This gave it a great vogue and impetus and it is now said to contain over two million members.

A great number of teaching and nursing congregations of women found the rule suitable for their needs and, therefore, belong to one or another of the Third Orders.

The Order of *Dominicans,* or Friars Preachers, sometimes called the Black Friars, from the white mantle worn over a black habit, was founded by St. Dominic in 1215. He went to Rome to get official sanction for his Order, but was told that he must adopt one of the existing rules. He chose the Rule of St. Augustine, having been an Augustinian Canon. In 1216 he obtained from Honorius III permission to form a congregation of Canons Regular of St. Augustine with a special mission to preach. In 1218 and 1221 these powers and privileges were still further extended, especially in the direction of preaching. The Order took definite shape at two general chapters held in 1220 and 1221. The Rule of St. Augustine was supplemented by additional regulations. The life is very austere—midnight office, perpetual abstinence from meat, frequent disciplines, prolonged fasts and silence. Upon St. Dominic's insistence, they adopted the Franciscan ideal of corporate poverty, as distinct from the individual poverty of the monks, and so became a Mendicant Order.

The Order had an extraordinarily rapid growth, as preaching by the secular clergy had become almost a lost art, and the Preaching Friars supplied a very genuine need. Missionary work was also a specialty and they followed the explorers to all outlying parts of the world. Cortez and Pizarro both had Dominican Friars on their expeditions. St. Dominic also made a special effort to found houses in the

University towns. Paris, Bologna, Palencia, Oxford, Padua, Cologne, Vienna, Prague and Salamanca had thriving houses at a very early date and these institutions soon exercised a potent influence on the university life and polity. Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas Aquinas were both Dominicans and the Dominican school of theology to this day maintains the principles and methods elaborated by St. Thomas.

The Order had the usual ups and downs, revivals and reforms, but as it was always the Dominican policy to keep their troubles to themselves, and to clean house from within, there are no reform movements of historical importance.

The Order obtained an unenviable notoriety at one time by its close association with the Inquisition, the Chief Inquisitor in nearly all countries having usually been a Dominican. In 1425 Martin V relaxed the Rule relating to ownership of property. Fifty years later this relaxation became universal and the order thus ceased to be Mendicant.

There is a "Second" and "Third" Order. The nuns were to have been strictly enclosed and purely contemplative, but in the course of time they undertook educational work. The Rule for the Third Order was not formed until the 15th century. St. Catharine of Sienna was a Dominican Tertiary. So was St. Rose of Lima.

There are about 4,500 Dominican friars, including lay brothers, and 300 friaries, throughout the world, with 100 nunneries and 1,500 nuns.

The *Servites,* or "Servants of Mary," an Order under the Rule of St. Augustine, were formed in 1233 by seven merchants of Florence. In 1256 they received papal sanction and in 1424 they were ranked as a Mendicant Order. They undertook missions to Tartary, India and Japan. Their greatest member was their fifth General, St. Filippo Benizzi who died in 1285. At the present day there are 64 Servite houses, mostly in Italy, although two or three are in America and in England. There are Servite nuns and Tertiaries who devote themselves to primary education. Their habit is black.

The *Carmelities,* sometimes called the White Friars, because of their dress, a white mantle over a brown habit, are one of the four Mendicant Orders. Their origin is a subject of controversy which at one time became so acute that in 1698 a decree was issued by Rome forbidding both sides to further discuss the matter until a formal decision was promulgated, which never has been done. One side claimed that the order was started by the Prophet Elias, who founded a community on Mount Carmel in Palestine. His spiritual descendants some centuries later were converted by St. Peter and, taking the Virgin as their protectress, built a chapel to her honour on Mount Carmel and dwelt there ever since.

Historically, it is known that in the middle of the 12th century a Crusader from Italy named Berthold and some companions established themselves as hermits on Mount Carmel. In 1210 the Patriarch of

Jerusalem gave them a rule. The life was strictly eremitical. The monks were to live in separate houses and devote themselves to prayer, work, silence, seclusion, abstinence and austerity. This rule received papal sanction in 1226. In 1240, however, the hermits were driven out of Palestine and forced to go to Europe where they separated into different countries. Several irregular establishments were founded by these fugitives. In 1247, a General Chapter was held and St. Simon Stock was elected General. During his generalship the rule was altered to conform to necessary Western standards, and the life was turned from eremitical into cenobitic, but on mendicant rather than monastic lines. The policy and government were likewise changed and thus the Carmelites became one of the four great Mendicant Orders. Under its new rule of 1247 it became very popular, especially in England, and spread all over Europe. Further relaxations in the rule were gradually introduced until in 1562 the great St. Theresa started her reform movement. With the help of St. John of the Cross, who did for the monasteries what she did for the nunneries, there were founded in Spain during her life time seventeen institutions for women and fifteen for men which were devoted to the stricter observance. Her new rule, which was more severe than that of 1247, required adherents to wear sandals instead of shoes and stockings, so that the reformed order became known as the *Discalced* or *Barefooted Carmelities*. In 1593 the reformed Monasteries were made into an independent Order by papal act, and since that time both Orders have existed, though at the present time the Discalced are by far the more numerous and thriving. There are some 2,000 Carmelite friars and a much larger number of nuns.

The *Augustinians* is a generic name for religious orders that follow the so-called "Rule of St. Augustine." The chief of these are the Augustinian Canons, the Augustinian Hermits or Friars (the latter being the fourth of the great Mendicant Orders), the Ursulines, nuns of the Visitation and many others. The *Augustinian Canons,* also called Austin Canons, or Canons Regular, were formed officially in 1339, but existed in practical form for two or three hundred years before that. A canon is a man who holds some benefice from a cathedral or collegiate church. In early times he did not have to be a priest and could marry. So many abuses arose from this laxity that in 1059 the Lateran Synod urged reforms. The clergy of many cathedrals throughout Europe responded to the appeal, and looking for a rule, took for a model the directions which St. Augustine gave to his clergy while he was Bishop of Hippo. This was elaborated into what, since the 11th century, has been known as the "Rule of St. Augustine." Being very general in character and, therefore, adapted to a great variety of Orders and Congregations, it has served since the 13th century as the basis for more Rules than even the Rule of St. Benedict.

The Augustinian Canons took the vows of poverty, chastity and

obedience, and to that extent were like monks, but they continued their duties as clerics, and served the parishes and peoples in their care.

In 1339 these numerous local and independent communities were organized by Boniface XII into a regular Order along the same general lines as those laid down for the Benedictines. There were some thirty congregations, with an extraordinarily large number of branch houses. England alone had 200 houses at the time of the Dissolution. After an interval of some hundreds of years three houses were opened in England in the latter part of the 19th century. Most of the Congregations had convents for nuns who were called Canonesses, whose rule, however, was much more lax than that for men. For a long time the houses for women have become practically a sort of superior almshouse for impoverished gentlewomen.

The *Premonstratensians*, also called Norbertines, or White Canons, are Augustinian Canons, founded by St. Norbert in 1120 at Premontré in France. He was a friend of St. Bernard and was greatly influenced by Cistercian ideals, but as his followers were Canons Regular, their work was preaching and serving the parishes in their district. The Order spread rapidly until in the 14th century there were 1,300 houses for men and 400 for women. Only eight houses survived the troubles of the 18th century. There are now about 20 monasteries and 1,000 canons, mostly in Belgium.

The *Augustinian Hermits* or *Friars* were formed by the Popes in the middle of the 13th century in order to co-ordinate and gather under proper control, the numerous small bodies of hermits who were living in Italy under different rules. They were formed into one general Order, under the rule of St Augustine, and called the Augustinian Hermits or simply the Augustinian Order. As they ceased to be hermits this term became, and ever since has remained, a misnomer. They ranked as friars and became the fourth of the Mendicant Orders. The rule was mild, meat being allowed four times a week. The habit is black. The Order grew rapidly and came to have 2,000 friaries with 30,000 members. It passed through many vicissitudes and in the 16th century a reform was started called the *Discalced Hermits of St. Augustine*. Luther was a St. Augustine friar. There were many convents for Augustinian Hermitesses, mostly belonging to the stricter or barefooted observance. Several exist to the present day, in Europe and America, devoted to education and hospital work. There is also a Tertiary Order for both men and women.

The *Hieronymites*, a common name for four congregations of hermits living according to the Rule of St. Augustine with additions from St. Jerome. (1) The Spanish Hieronymities were founded near Toledo in 1375, grew to power and influence, possessed some of the finest monasteries in Spain, including that at the Escurial. There were nuns. The monks devoted themselves to study and missionary work.

This branch of the order was suppressed in 1835. (2) A reform of the first Order effected in 1424, and now extinct. (3) Poor Hermits of St. Jerome which once had 50 houses, but of which only two, at Rome and Viterbo, now exist. (4) Hermits of St. Jerome at Fiesole, established in 1406 but united to (3) in 1668. Their habit was white with a black cloak.

The Brothers of the Common Life, chiefly famous because Thomas à Kempis belonged to it, were founded by Gerard Groot, with the assistance of Florentins Radewyn, about 1380. The inmates lived together, without vows, and so could return to the world when they chose. They had to earn their own living, and while in community were bound to observe ordinary vows. Their chief work was copying manuscripts, and after the invention of printing the Order gradually declined, until the 17th century, when it ceased to exist entirely.

The *Capuchins* are an offshoot of the Franciscans. In 1520 Matteo di Bessi, an "Observant" Franciscan, started a movement to go back to the perfect ideal of St. Francis. In spite of the opposition of his superiors, Clement VII sanctioned his efforts, and he and his companions were formed into a congregation called "Hermit Friars Minor," as a branch of the Conventual Franciscans, with a vicar of their own. They were called Capuchins because of their hood (Capuche) which distinguished their dress from the ordinary brown garment of the Franciscans. They had a checkered early career, as Matteo went back to the Observants. Their second Vicar was dismissed for insubordination and the third married and became a Calvinist. They were pretty nearly suppressed, and their permission to preach was revoked. In a few years, however, it was restored to them and they spread with extraordinary rapidity until they became, and have since remained, one of the most numerous of the religious orders. In 1619 they were freed from their dependence upon the Conventual Franciscans, and became an independent Order with a General of their own. At that time they had 1,500 houses. They were one of the chief factors in the Catholic Counter-Reformation, being extraordinarily successful in making converts from Protestantism. At the end of the 18th century the number of Capuchin Friars was estimated at 31,000.

Like other religious bodies they suffered but survived the troubles of the next 150 years, and in late years have grown rapidly. At present they have over 500 monasteries, 300 hospices, or lesser houses, and 9,500 friars. One of their specialties has always been missionary work, and they now maintain some 200 stations in the outlying parts of the world.

The rule is as near as possible a literal carrying out of St. Francis's basic principles, and is very severe. Absolute poverty, both individual and communal, the monasteries being forbidden to accumulate either property or resources, or ever to have more than a few days' supply of food on hand; they go barefoot, not being allowed even to wear sandals.

Their chief external works are preaching and spiritual ministrations among the poor.

There are Capuchin nuns, called Capuchines, and lay members. The nuns were founded in 1538 in Naples, and lived so austere a life that they were called "Sisters of Suffering." A few Capuchine Convents still exist.

The *Minims* were founded by St. Francis of Paula in 1474. St. Francis was a Franciscan but he left his friary and went to live in a cave. Some disciples joined him and they called themselves "Hermits of St. Francis," but as they proposed to outdo the Franciscans in poverty, fasts and other austerities, they finally took the name of Minims (*minimi,* least) in contradistinction to the Friars Minor (*minores,* less). It is the most austere of all Orders in matters of diet, the members keeping perpetual lent, and not eating even milk and butter. Instead of a prior or abbot or rector, their superiors are called Correctors and they are governed by a Corrector General. The Order prospered and at one time there were 450 houses. It ranks as a Mendicant Order. At present there are 20 monasteries, mostly in Sicily. There have been Minim nuns and tertiaries. The habit is black.

St. Francis, the founder, was sent for by Louis XI of France and is supposed to have been a great comfort to that king at the time of his death.

The *Theatines* were founded in 1524 by St. Gaetano and several others, one of whom was Carafa, afterward Pope Paul IV, but then Bishop of Theate (whence the name) in Southern Italy. They are Regular Clerics and their object is to recall the clergy to an edifying life and the laity to the practice of virtue. It produced one pope and 250 cardinals, archbishops and bishops, built many fine churches, and, after a career of great usefulness, began to decline in the 19th century. In 1909 Pius X decreed its union with another Order. There were Theatine nuns, founded by the Venerable Ursula Benicasa in 1583. She was a very remarkable woman whose visions and ecstacies attracted great attention. In 1617 Venerable Ursula withdrew from her Community with 33 companions, in order to live a more austere life, and founded the order of *Theatine Hermitesses.* The rules of this order were approved in 1623. The Theatine sisters at one time had a great vogue but have now almost ceased to exist.

The *Ursulines* were founded at Brescia by St. Angela Merici, in 1535. She was canonized in 1807 as St. Agnes of Brescia. In 1572 Gregory XIII declared it an Order under the rule of St. Augustine. St. Ursula is its Patron and it is specially devoted to the teaching of girls and the care of the sick. In the 18th century it grew very large, having 15,000 to 20,000 members, but in modern times the congregations taking simple vows, like the Sisters of Mercy, are more popular.

The *Barnabites* or Regular Clerics of St. Paul, were founded by

St. Anton Maria Zaccaria in 1535. It gets its name from the Church of St. Barnabas in Milan, the headquarters of the Order. The members take a fourth vow not to accept any office or dignity save by the express command of the Pope, and they devote themselves to preaching, missions, care of the sick, education, and in especial, to the study and exposition of St. Paul's Epistles. The Order has never grown very large, but has produced a number of saints and scholars.

The *Jesuits,* or "Clerics Regulars of the Society of Jesus," are not in the strictest sense an Order, but are usually considered one, and because of the rule of corporate poverty (save in the case of Colleges, where funds may be accumulated for the support of the students), is often classed as mendicant. Its founder, St. Ignatius Loyola, called it the "Company of Jesus." The term "Jesuit" was a term of reproach, but it is now used by friends and foes alike. It introduced a new idea into the Church. Hitherto all Regulars made a point of the choral office in choir. Ignatius thought that the times required a body of highly trained men who could be sent anywhere. Therefore he combined the idea of the Canons Regular, who were educated priests, with the friars who were without fixed abode or communal allegiance. To give more time for outer work, he did away with the choir office, but made the obligation of the breviary a personal affair. He also developed the idea of obedience. The Rule of St Benedict, and all subsequent Rules, fixed the duties of the abbot as well as of the monk, and gave to the latter certain very definite constitutional rights. It was monarchial in form, but a limited or constitutional monarchy. Ignatius's Rule is that of absolute despotism. To use his own words, "In all things *except sin* I ought to do the will of my superior and not my own." In 1537, after years of preparation, Ignatius and his six or seven companions formed themselves into a Company whose object was to fight the battles of the Pope. They laid their project before Paul III, and received such encouragement that in April 1539 they took formal vows to obey any superior chosen among themselves. The official recognition of the Society was by bull dated September 27, 1540. Already some months previously, St. Francis Xavier and Simon Rodriguez had been sent to the King of Portugal, who started St. Francis Xavier on his wonderful missionary journey. At first the Society was limited to sixty members but this restriction was removed in 1543. When Ignatius died in 1556 they had grown to have 45 professed fathers, 2,000 ordinary members, distributed over twelve provinces, with more than 100 colleges and houses.

Loyola made habitual intercourse with the world a prime duty, and to this end he suppressed all peculiarities of dress or of rule as tended to put obstacles in the way of his followers. The Jesuit has no home; the whole world is his parish.

The Jesuits were formed to fight Protestantism, and even their enemies acknowledge that almost unaided they rolled back the tide of

the Reformation from that half of Europe which was not already engulfed. Their chief methods of work were as confessors and advisors to the powerful and wealthy, as educators and as preachers. For 300 years the Jesuit schools have been admittedly the best in Europe and as late as 1901 they were said to be the best in France. But it was as missionaries that they had their greatest success. Whether to the heretic of Germany or the heathen of China or Paraguay, the Jesuits have an extraordinary record of devoted, cheerful, efficient and self-sacrificing service.

The criticisms associated in nearly all Protestant minds with the name Jesuit, arose from conditions entirely contrary to the expressed will of Ignatius. After his death Laynez was elected General, and in some ways this astute and learned man is the real founder of the Society as history knows it. Seeing what a wonderful instrument it could become in the political arena, he disregarded Ignatius's plain injunction to his followers to eschew politics, and he so interpreted other regulations that they came to have the exact opposite of the meaning Ignatius had intended. It is in the field of politics that the history of the Jesuits has been disastrous, and it is because of this misguided activity that they gained the hostility of so many rulers and peoples.

One hundred years after its foundation the Society had 36 provinces, 800 houses with 15,000 members.

It is impossible in a sketch of this kind to go into details of the stormy career of the Society, of how they were repeatedly turned out of every country in Europe, until in 1775 they were legally suppressed by Pope Clement XIV. At this date they had 41 provinces and 22,589 members, of whom half were priests. They retired to Russia and Prussia, where they kept their organization intact until the decree of suppression was rescinded in 1814. They were expelled from France in 1765, came back in disguise as "Fathers of the Faith" until obliged to retire by Napoleon in 1804. They returned in 1814, were licensed in 1822, dispersed by the revolution of 1830, reappeared under difficulties during the reign of Louis Philippe, recovered the right to teach freely after the revolution of 1848, became the leading educational and ecclesiastical power in France during the Second Empire, were expelled in 1880, returned quietly and were again expelled in 1901. Their history in most other countries is similarly checkered. It is not known how many members there are at present but the estimate is about 20,000.

The *Oratorians* were founded in 1575 by the Florentine priest, St. Philip Neri. The Congregation is composed of priests, living under obedience, but with no vows, who devote themselves to prayer, preaching and the sacraments. English Oratorians were founded by Cardinal Newman in 1847.

The *Order of the Visitation* is one of the more famous modern Orders. It was founded in 1607 by St. Francis de Sales, in concert with

St. Jeanne de Chantal. for "strong souls with weak bodies," who were deterred from entering the Orders already existing by their inability to undertake severe corporal austerities. The Order spread rapidly, counted 20 houses before the death of St. Francis in 1622 and 80 before that of St. Jeanne in 1641. The cult of the Sacred Heart of Jesus arose out of this Order through revelations to the Blessed Marguerite Marie Alacoque, who was a nun of the Visitation at the Convent of Paray-le-Monial, and who had her first revelations in 1675.

The *Order of the Sacred Heart* was founded in 1800 to give fuller expression to the cult. The nuns devote themselves to the higher branches of female education.

The *Sisters of Mercy of St. Borromeo* was founded in 1620 and made into a religious community in 1652, and did not receive official sanction until 1859. There are about 4,000 sisters, living principally in Austria and France. They are sometimes called "Sisters of St. Charles" after Charles Borromeo the famous Milanese saint and archbishop, who was called the Apostle of Charity.

A similar organization, known as the *Sisters of Mercy* was founded in Ireland by Catharine Elizabeth McAuley in 1827. They devote themselves to all works of mercy, take simple but perpetual vows, and live under the Rule of St. Augustine. It is one of the popular orders in America, where they have nearly 5,000 sisters, teach over 100,000 children in their schools and manage over 50 hospitals and nearly 70 orphanages.

The *Maurists* were reformed Benedictines, started by Didier de la Cour in Lorraine. The reform spread to France and in 1621 was formed the famous French "Congregation of St. Maur," after the great Maurus, a disciple of St. Benedict, who introduced the Benedictine rule into France in the 6th century. For two hundred years the Order included in its ranks most of the great scholars and historians of France, and it is famous for the invaluable work done in collecting, preserving and editing the literary treasures of the past. The Congregation was suppressed at the Revolution, the last Superior-General with forty of his monks dying on the scaffold.

The *Lazarists* were founded by St. Vincent de Paul in 1624 and were made a congregation in 1632. Their special objects are the religious instruction of the lower classes, the training of priests, and foreign missions. They grew slowly and steadily in spite of interruptions. They were expelled from France during the Revolution, from Italy in 1871, from Germany in 1873, and from France in 1903, but they still maintain thriving missions in numerous heathen countries. There are about 3,000 members at present.

The *Sisters of Charity* were also founded by St. Vincent de Paul in 1633 to minister to the poor and sick, and to supplement the work of the "Sisterhood of Charity," previously founded by him, but whose

members were usually married women with domestic duties. The Sisters of Charity or as St. Vincent de Paul preferred, "the Daughters of Charity," take annual vows only, and are free to give up their work and return to the world at the end of any year. The institution has done and is doing superb work, and is very large, with many branches in America. There are about 25,000 members.

The *Trappists* are a reform of the Cistercians, started by Armand J. le B. de Rancé, Abbot of La Trappe in 1664. He not only returned to the primitive rule of St. Benedict, but introduced such additional austerities that the Order became the most austere in Christendom that has had any permanence. Many Cistercian monasteries and nunneries were persuaded to adopt the rule of the Abbey of La Trappe, but remained in the regular Cistercian Order. It was not until 1794, after the monks were expelled from La Trappe and other places in France, that the fugitive Abbot of La Trappe, Dom Augustine, was named, by the Holy See, abbot of all houses living the stricter rule. They were and are called "Order of Reformed Cistercians," or "Cistercians of the Strict Observance." They returned to La Trappe in 1817, secured Citeaux in 1898, the home of Cistercianism, and are now a thriving and vigorous Order with 58 monasteries, 1,300 choir monks, 1,700 lay brothers, 15 nunneries 350 choir nuns and 500 lay sisters.

The Trappists abstain wholly from meat and fish, rarely eat eggs, have only bread and water on certain days, must go barefooted occasionally, must sleep in their day clothes, work three and one-half hours and spend seven hours daily in church services—thus reversing St. Benedict's division—and have rigid rules regarding silence. Their principal outer work is education and missionizing.

The *Passionist Fathers* were founded by St. Paul of the Cross in 1720, and sanctioned in 1737. The full title of the institute is "The Congregation of Discalced Clerks of the Most Holy Cross and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ." St. Paul says that our Lord dictated the Rule of the order to him as fast as he could write it. They combine the contemplative life of the Carthusians or Trappists with the active life of the Jesuits or Lazarists. Their object is two fold: Sanctification of self and sanctification of others, especially through devotion to the Passion of Jesus Christ, which they make into a fourth vow. They rank as Mendicants. Their principal method of work is by giving of missions and retreats. The Order, which is growing constantly, now has 94 houses and about 1,400 members in all parts of the world.

The *Redemptorists,* or "Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer," were founded by St. Alfonso Liguori in 1732. They devote themselves to the religious instruction of the poor and are expressly forbidden to engage in secular education.

The *Paulist Fathers.* There are several Congregations of religious who have taken St. Paul the Apostle as their patron: The *Hermits of*

St. Paul, formed in 1250 by the Blessed Eusebius of Grau in Hungary; *Hermits of St. Paul of France,* also called *Brothers of Death,* founded by William Collier in 1620, who devote themselves to the dead, burials, etc.; but the best known is the *Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle.* It was founded by Father Isaac Thomas Hecker in 1858. He, with certain companions, were Redemptorists, but being suspected of disloyalty, were expelled from the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. They appealed to Rome and the expulsion was disapproved. Instead of having themselves reinstated, however, they asked and received permission to found a new Order which should be devoted to making converts to the Catholic Faith. Father Hecker claimed that the Holy Spirit had long intimated to him that he was set apart to do some great work in converting this country. The Congregation now has missions in over 25 dioceses in America, and has spread to England and Australia.

JOHN BLAKE.

She is right in saying that desire must precede will and that the spiritual problem of many sincere travellers along the Path of Life and Immortality is how to arouse desire. Desire may be cultivated like any other quality, but it is of slow growth and we do not want to grow slowly. So we inquire of Nature for the secret, "How can its growth be forced?"

The answer is by love. Love is the only power in the Universe which is great enough to overcome human inertia. All other forces fail, but if we love enough we can do anything. We must pray then for more love, and as love must have an object, we must pray the Master for the power to love him, and to love him more and more.

If we could only see things as they really are; if we could once feel the yearning tenderness and passionate love which he has for us, it would be easy to love him in return; but we are blind and deaf and dumb. If we could realize his loneliness, it would help, for he is very lonely. He has, of course, plenty of inner companionship—Heaven is full of saints—but he suffers bitterly from the lack of human companionship and his heart goes out in a boundless stream of love towards any soul who shows signs of waking up. That love, if we will let it reach us, will light an answering flame in our own hearts and with that new love will come desire.

To love the Master more and more is the only short cut in spiritual attainment. "Faith and Works": for we must obey if we would love more; we must do the deed if we would have the power.

THE MYSTERY OF ALL TIME*

THE inner light which guides men to greatness, and makes them noble, is a mystery through all time and must remain so while Time lasts for us; but there come moments, even in the midst of ordinary life, when Time has no hold upon us, and then all the circumstance of outward existence falls away, and we find ourselves face to face with the mystery beyond. In great trouble, in great joy, in keen excitement, in serious illness, these moments come. Afterwards they seem very wonderful, looking back upon them.

What is this mystery, and why is it so veiled, are the burning questions for anyone who has begun to realise its existence. Trouble most often rouses men to consciousness of it, and forces them to ask these questions when those, whom one has loved better than oneself, are taken away into the formless abyss of the unknown by death, or are changed, by the experiences of life, till they are no longer recognisable as the same; then comes the wild hunger for knowledge. Why is it so? What is it, that surrounds us with a great dim cloud into which all loved things plunge in time and are lost to us, obliterated, utterly taken from us? It is this which makes life so unbearable to the emotional natures, and which develops selfishness in narrow hearts. If there is no certainty and no permanence in life, then it seems to the Egotist, that there is no reasonable course but to attend to one's own affairs, and be content with the happiness of the first person singular. There are many persons sufficiently generous in temperament to wish others were happy also, and who, if they saw any way to do it, would gladly redress some of the existing ills —the misery of the poor, the social evil, the sufferings of the diseased, the sorrow of those made desolate by death—these things the sentimental philanthropist shudders to think of. He does not act because he can do so little. Shall he take one miserable child and give it comfort when millions will be enduring the same fate when that one is dead? The inexorable cruelty of life continues on its giant course, and those who were born rich and healthy live in pleasant places, afraid to think of the horrors life holds within it. Loss, despair, unutterable pain, comes at last, and the one who has hitherto been fortunate is on a level with those to whom misery has been familiarised by a lifetime of experience. For trouble bites hardest when it springs on a new victim. Of course, there are profoundly selfish natures which do not suffer in this sense, which look only for personal comfort and are content with the small horizon visible to one person's sight; for these, there is but little trouble in the world, there is none of the passionate pain which exists in sensitive and poetic natures. The born artist is aware of pain as soon as he is

* Reprinted from *Lucifer*, Vol. I, p. 116.

aware of pleasure; he recognises sadness as a part of human life before it has touched his own. He has an innate consciousness of the mystery of the ages, that thing stirring within man's soul and which enables him to outlive pain and become great, which leads him on the road to the divine life. This gives him enthusiasm, a superb heroism indifferent to calamity; if he is a poet he will write his heart out, even for a generation that has no eyes or ears for him; if he desires to help others personally, he is capable of giving his very life to save one wretched child from out a million of miserable ones. For it is not his puny personal effort in the world that he considers—not his little show of labour done; what he is conscious of is the over-mastering desire to work with the beneficent forces of super-nature, to become one with the divine mystery, and when he can forget time and circumstances, he is face to face with that mystery. Many have fancied they must reach it by death; but none have come back to tell us that this is so. We have no proof that man is not as blind beyond the grave as he is on this side of it. Has he entered the eternal thought? If not, the mystery is a mystery still.

To one who is entering occultism in earnest, all the trouble of the world seems suddenly apparent. There is a point of experience when father and mother, wife and child, become indistinguishable, and when they seem no more familiar or friendly than a company of strangers. The one dearest of all may be close at hand and unchanged, and yet is as far as if death had come between. Then all distinction between pleasure and pain, love and hate, has vanished. A melancholy, keener than that felt by a man in his first fierce experience of grief, overshadows the soul. It is the pain of the struggle to break the shell in which man has imprisoned himself. Once broken then there is no more pain; all ties are severed, all personal demands are silenced forever. The man has forced himself to face the great mystery, which is now a mystery no longer, for he has become a part of it. It is essentially the mystery of the ages, and these have no longer any meaning for him to whom time and space and all other limitations are but passing experiences. It has become to him a reality, profound, indeed, because it is bottomless, wide, indeed, because it is limitless. He has touched on the greatness of life, which is sublime in its impartiality and effortless generosity. He is friend and lover to all those living beings that come within his consciousness, not to the one or two chosen ones only—which is indeed only an enlarged selfishness. While a man retains his humanity, it is certain that one or two chosen ones will give him more pleasure by contact, than all the rest of the beings in the Universe and all the heavenly host; but he has to remember and recognise what this preference is. It is not a selfish thing which has to be crushed out, if the love is the love that gives; freedom from attachments is not a meritorious condition in itself. The freedom needed is not from those who cling to you, but from those to whom you cling. The familiar phrase of the lover "I cannot live without

you" must be words which cannot be uttered, to the occultist. If he has but one anchor, the great tides will sweep him away into nothingness. But the natural preference which must exist in every man for a few persons is one form of the lessons of Life. By contact with these other souls he has other channels by which to penetrate to the great mystery. For every soul touches it, even the darkest. Solitude is a great teacher, but society is even greater. It is so hard to find and take the highest part of those we love, that in the very difficulty of the search there is a serious education. We realise when making that effort, far more clearly what it is that creates the mystery in which we live, and makes us so ignorant. It is the swaying, vibrating, never-resting desires of the animal soul in man. The life of this part of man's nature is so vigorous and strongly developed from the ages during which he has dwelt in it, that it is almost impossible to still it so as to obtain contact with the noble spirit. This constant and confusing life, this ceaseless occupation with the trifles of the hour, this readiness in surface emotion, this quickness to be pleased, amused or distressed, is what baffles our sight and dulls our inner senses. Till we can use these the mystery remains in its Sphinx-like silence.

If it were said to an embryo in the womb, "Outside the narrow place of the womb is another world, a great space, a great breadth, a sky, a land, a sun, a moon, and other things," never would the imagining of it appear true save by faith.

Even so the dwellers in the narrow world of reason cannot, save by faith, understand the world of power, till man's soul from the narrow womb of the world of reason cometh to the unseen world of power, or by the death of nature and of will which they call "the second birth" even as Isa (Jesus) hath written.

SUHRAWARDI.

WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

AT about my fifteenth year I became a member of the Methodist Church. I had always attended Sunday School and my parents were considered "church going" people. For a few months before joining the church, I passed through a period of real childish devotion, but strangely enough had kept my feelings quite to myself, although I had asked our minister to explain one or two points which in my childish mind seemed of great importance, and he, with the best intentions in the world, mixed me up more than ever. It is so long ago that I have forgotten just what the points were that troubled me, but what is clearly fixed in my memory is that he finally said, "You join the Church and after a while everything will be all right." This I promptly did, and very shortly afterwards insisted that I had grown too old to attend Sunday School, and stopped going. I went to Church spasmodically for a year or two. I always said the Lord's Prayer at night, and prayed for my entire family. I can remember that it very often took me so long to mention all the names that I would go to sleep in the midst of my prayer, and wake up very cold and very cross from having knelt so long beside my bed. At nineteen I was married. My husband, who had been brought up in the Episcopal Church, quite disapproved of my laxness in Church matters and did all in his power to arouse my interest. Because I loved him very much and would have gone to the end of the world to please him, I attended his church, and a few months after our marriage, was confirmed an Episcopalian.

Still my soul slept quietly on. As time passed I took quite an active part in several of the Church activities and by degrees became very much interested in the work. At that time the Sunday School presented quite a problem, a committee was formed to deal with the situation, and I was asked to act as secretary. At one of these meetings I met for the first time one who has since become my friend. We exchanged the most formal greeting and strange as it seems to me now, I remember the thought flashing through my mind,—"I shall not like you." At the same time I dimly felt that I had never met any one just like her before. The meeting went on; nothing unusual happened—at least nothing that I was conscious of—and yet for me everything changed from that moment. I do not mean that I realized it then. I was far from doing so; but what I now know really happened was that my soul woke up, just shook itself out of its drowsiness and took charge, very quietly, but none the less surely. The fight between my lower and my

higher self began—the fight that begins with each one when he hears his call, and goes on and on, because our lower natures have controlled us for so long, and contest every step before they are conquered.

It was my good fortune a few months later to become a small part of some work being carried on in the neighborhood, and my duties brought me in daily contact with the person in charge. By slow degrees (it fills me with amazement as I look back and realize how long I went about with my eyes shut) I began to realize that the methods of my superior were unlike any that I had yet encountered, and it puzzled me. Then I was permitted to meet quite frequently a group of people who were also interested in the work, and their attitude toward everything was foreign to anything I had ever known before. I think at first it was curiosity which I felt. I wanted to know what it was that they had found to help them. I knew that one or two of my friends had had very unhappy experiences, and as I watched I wondered what it was that helped them to rise above the suffering. And then one day I heard from one quite outside the work that this group of people were members of The Theosophical Society. I was amazed, astounded. I had the idea that Theosophists were very queer, eccentric people, and here I had been for months and months, seeing my friends almost daily, and yet the word Theosophy had never been mentioned in my presence. It was what they were, each in his or her own way, that had counted, and as time had passed had filled me with a stronger and stronger desire to be like them. What more can I add,—but that it shook me awake. I decided that if Theosophy, and the Theosophic method of living, could help them to be the men and women constant association with them had shown me they were, I wanted just that to help me, and so I asked permission to join the Society.

B. W. A.

The watchword of the present time is, Trust. *Not a dogged holding on, but a happy knowledge that* his *plan shall triumph; that his Will shall prevail in you as in all.*

Book of Items.

WHY I DO NOT JOIN THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

NOT being a member, it is obvious that I can know little or nothing of the Theosophical Society; and to write of subjects of which one is ignorant may well appear both presumptuous and foolish. I am not attempting, however, to discuss the society as it actually is, but only that aspect which it presents to me. My point of view is perhaps so erroneous that more knowledge would radically alter it: on the other hand such knowledge can only be gained by serious study from the inside and unless I were able to bring to the society a more profound enthusiasm than I have yet felt I do not consider that my proper place is within it. From the standpoint of members this may appear a vicious circle. I consider it merely the avoidance of one form of hypocrisy.

For many years I have watched the society—from the outside, of course—and have been on friendly terms with several of its members. My first impression was that it concerned itself primarily with Eastern religions, and in particular with the study of the occult. Time, acting possibly upon me and possibly also upon the society itself, has since so modified this belief that I now regard Theosophy as more in the nature of a school of ethics. To some extent, however, the first impression has survived and it is from these two aspects that I view the society.

In the religions of the East I take only that vague interest which attaches itself to anything exotic. Since they have shaped the destinies of unnumbered millions, any thinking man should be glad to know more of them. But there are hundreds of things that any thinking man should be glad to know more of and I see no reason for granting the preference to Oriental beliefs. Were I to attempt to gain any acquaintance with them, I should be inspired by an historical, not a spiritual interest. That they contain much of Truth I do not doubt, but so I presume, does every formula of faith ever promulgated and no formula do I accept. For I consider it an impossibility for any finite mind to define the secrets of the infinite as one might draw up a set of rules for intercollegiate football. We live in a world bounded by space and time and we cannot dogmatize upon conditions when there shall be neither space nor time.

I have, however, no wish to engage in a theological discussion for which I am peculiarly unfitted. I wish merely to point out that at the time when I regarded the Theosophical Society as primarily interested in these things the occultism of the Orient appeared no more convincing

than the materialistic saint-worship of Roman Catholicism. For the purposes of illustration, I may perhaps be permitted to quote from "Questions and Answers" in an early number of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY (July, 1903, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 37):

"QUESTION: Can one be benefited by repeating the sentence, *Om mani padme hum,* providing he does not know the right intonation, etc.?

"ANSWER: No. The right intonation must be acquired. The sentence contains an invocation to the Higher Self, the Jewel in the Lotus. The only way in which the higher self can be invoked is by attuning the mind and feeling so that they vibrate in harmony with the higher nature. This vibration is the 'right intonation,' and therefore as the state of the mind and feelings depends upon the life we live the invocation can only be properly intoned by living the appropriate life."

If this is to be taken literally, it strikes me—to be quite rude—as rubbish; if somewhat figuratively, as a totally unnecessary elaboration of a simple if profound truth. The meaning that it conveys to me is that the life which one leads determines the extent to which one can develop the higher portion of one's nature. If this be so—and I should be the last to gainsay it—why confuse the issue with vague pseudo-scientific phraseology of what appears to be a kind of moral physics? And above all, why seek assistance in the repetition of a magic foreign phrase? Sincere prayer of any sort is doubtless of benefit, but this does not seem to me a question of sincere prayer, but of superstition, of the same kind of thing that induced Luther to climb on his knees the Scala Santa of the Lateran. If Lhassa were as accessible as Rome, the sight of Thibetan lamas incessantly rattling their prayer-mills as familiar to us as wax candles burning before the image of a saint, the resemblance would, I fancy, be borne home to many of us.

I am, of course, thoroughly aware that the Theosophical Society has no more connection with Lamaism than with Catholicism and, moreover, that one may well say: "What if wax candles and prayer-mills are fundamentally the same? Each is to the user a means of worship and is therefore good." Quite possibly that is true, but it does not explain why a mind which is unable to reconcile itself to the complex dogma of the Catholic Church should seek in the fastnesses of Asia an even more complex, more arbitrary statement of eternal mysteries.

Yet to this, or so it seems to the outsider, at least a part of the society's activity is devoted. Although I have never read *The Secret Doctrine* nor any exposition of it, I have had occasion to run over in the most cursory fashion the pages of the *Abridgment,* published, I understand, under the auspices of the society. To me it is inconceivable that the riddle of the universe is to be solved in such fashion. Rather does it remind me of a course in psychology I once took in college. At

the end of the year I had learned new names for many things but I knew no more how one thinks or how to think than at the beginning. Practically the course resolved itself into the memorizing of a mass of utterly useless definitions. And in much the same way I make bold to regard *The Secret Doctrine*—as a triumph of the mathematical imagination, the work of poetic intellects striving, and striving in vain, to explain a mystery of which they knew, and by the nature of things could know, nothing.

It is, of course, obvious that I know nothing of *The Secret Doctrine.* The editor of the *Abridgment* says that she has spent fifteen years in studying it and my opinion of it, therefore, she, and others, will naturally treat with contempt. But I repeat that this method of approaching the great problem seems to me utterly hopeless and until I am convinced that I am wrong I shall certainly not embark upon any such difficult and protracted study. On this point I believe that, no matter how broad may be the constitution of the society, I am not in sympathy with the majority of the members. It is, then, one reason why I should not seek to enter.

Closely connected in my mind with these elaborate and dogmatic expositions of the cosmos is the question of occultism. That occultism exists I cannot deny—even if I would—but I confess that it does not interest me. I cannot convince myself, for example, that the discovery in the Occident of the now undoubted fact of hypnotism has been of any service to humanity. On the contrary—and on this point I believe that I am in agreement with some at least of the veteran members of the society—the exercise of psychic powers of various kinds appears to be frequently accompanied by something not far removed from degeneracy. In the East, the reputed home of this kind of knowledge, I do not perceive that it has in any way aided the great mass of mankind, spiritually or materially, while, if it has benefited those who have advanced far into its secrets, I must admit that I am no great friend of self-contained, aloof virtue. In short, in this connection at least, I am sufficient of a Tory to hold that progress is not always beneficial. Of that sort of mental power which may come from clear, hard thinking and pure living, I am not speaking; but there is clear thinking and pure living outside of the Theosophical Society.

That the Theosophical Society and the Society for Psychical Research are different things I thoroughly understand, just as I understand that the Theosophical Society is not a proselytizing organization for Buddhism, Presbyterianism, or any other form of religion. But I infer that the majority of the members look upon the matters I have been discussing from a standpoint totally different from mine, that the atmosphere of the society, if I may use the phrase, would be hostile to my personal views.

There is, however, quite another aspect in which the society appears

to outsiders. It has, or seems to have, a profound moral effect upon those who join it. I say seems because at times I am inclined to question whether to attribute this effect to the society is not to put the cart before the horse. Of persons sufficiently interested in spiritual matters to devote a large part of their time and energy to the serious consideration and discussion of the right way to live, we naturally expect a higher standard of personal conduct than from the average man on the street. The question that arises is to what extent the members draw their inspiration from the society, and to what extent the character of the society is determined by the natures of the members.

That the Theosophical Society is to-day composed of earnest persons, some of brilliant intellectual attainments, others in no way above the average, but all possessing in common the virtues of sincerity and enthusiasm, is not, I think, open to question. But this has been the case with all religious movements. It was so with the early Christian Church, with the first adherents of the Reformation, with the Pilgrim Fathers, with the first converts to Christian Science. In the beginning every religious innovation is misunderstood and ignorantly ridiculed, if not actually persecuted. In the face of this opposition the only incentive to a profession of faith is sincere conviction; nominal membership of the half-hearted and indifferent is the price paid for successful propaganda. Partly because they are clogged in this way the various divisions of the Christian Church now appear ineffective.

If one seeks a guarantee that in the years to come the Theosophical Society will not suffer in exactly the same way, one must find it in the validity of the principles that are peculiar to it. Of dogma I understand that the society has none, that it embraces men of all shades of religious belief. Its chief tenet I believe to be the Brotherhood of Man and its objects "such discovery and unfoldment of Truth as shall serve to announce and confirm a scientific basis for ethics" and the giving of assistance to those who seek by right living in this world to attain a higher life. If I have correctly summarized them it is self-evident that no one but a lunatic could find fault with the fundamental principles of the society. But is the structure that is built upon them suitable to the needs of every one? For me, personally, I do not think it is, and that is the chief reason I am not a member of the Theosophical Society.

Of my own attitude toward the search for Truth in the creeds of the Orient I have already spoken. I cannot convince myself that a scientific basis for anything is to be found in the very elaborate and very obscure writings which have come down to us through the ages. As an appeal to the emotions, as a stimulant and food for man's innate sense of right and passion for it, they may be—and doubtless are—of enormous value, but it is in this light that I should prefer to approach them, not as depositaries of esoteric doctrine. Imagine,

some centuries hereafter, a Japanese student seeking knowledge from the ancient wisdom of the Occident and turning to Dante. The beauty of the poem would remain and much of its ethical value; but what conviction would be carried to his mind by the successive circles of Hell, by the descriptions of Purgatory and Paradise?

If in this respect I am out of touch with what I take to be the society's attitude, I am but little more in sympathy with the practice of discussing and analyzing the more personal problems presented by daily life. I take it that a man who is really anxious to do his duty is usually in a position to see it. Whether he then does it or not is quite a different matter. Occasions arise, I know, of exceptional difficulty when judgment is befogged by the conflict of interests; but even then, assuming the existence of the necessary desire, common sense is a better guide than subtle reasoning. One need not, indeed, be very clever in order to be far too subtle in his morals. Like the child in the garden we sometimes pull up the plant of virtue to see how it is growing. If we contented ourselves with watering it now and then there would be more chance of its ultimately bearing blossoms.

Some years ago there appeared in one of the magazines an article on "Unselfishness" by Maeterlinck. When I began to read it I had what may be called a good working knowledge of what the thing meant; when I finished I had not the least idea. Nor do I believe that Maeterlinck's ability to wind in and out of his subject was in any way conducive to unselfish conduct on his part.

I am indeed inclined to believe that this kind of thing is positively pernicious. By obscuring ideas which are much more easily understood than their definitions, it provides a convenient solution for the old problem of how to eat one's cake and have it too, how to do what one wants and remain at peace with one's conscience. For persons of extreme spiritual sensitiveness, I have no doubt that the analysis of morality may be to some extent a necessity; to the ordinary man, on the other hand, "a scientific basis for ethics" may well prove to be merely a euphemism for moral sophistry.

That it has proved so in the case of the Theosophical Society I have no reason to believe, and, even if I had, this would be hardly the place in which to say so. Under any circumstances, I presume that the members, and not the society, are responsible for their individual behaviour, as for their individual belief. But I find, or fancy that I find, in the influence of the society a certain something that makes for hardness—a peculiar, intangible, refined hardness, but hardness none the less. It is perhaps something akin to the spiritual selfishness of the mediæval monk; or possibly it is the outcome of a deep-rooted, reasoned conviction that whatever is is for the best and that it is presumption to attempt to

alter it. Certainly it is, as I say, too intangible for me to attempt to describe it with any definiteness, but for me it exists.

That this should be so seems singular in the face of the cardinal tenet of the society, the Brotherhood of Man. But in practice it seems to me that this is not unfrequently translated into the Brotherhood of the Theosophical Society. Probably it is inevitable that a body of persons intensely interested in one subject should find themselves drawn closer and closer together, and should, to some extent, lose sympathy with the world outside. I believe, in fact, that this has occurred in the development of every idea or movement of sufficient force to influence men's actions; but it is not a result that I consider in itself desirable. Whether it is any more apparent in the case of the Theosophical Society than in that of any other religious body, I do not know; my point is simply that I have not been able to perceive that membership in the society increases one's sympathy with other atoms of the human race.

It is true that, as a philosophic concept, I have little notion what the society may mean by the Brotherhood of Man. But, as I have already said, in philosophical explanations of the constitution of the universe I take but scanty interest, for no matter how thoroughly to our satisfaction we may prove a theory, the proof is worthless, the result of logic working in a realm in which it has no place. From the standpoint to which I therefore confine myself, I hold that the Brotherhood of Man was set before the world nineteen hundred years ago; that the difficulty lies, not in expounding, but in living up to it.

This in short is the kernel of the whole matter. We may take it that any sane man is at bottom desirous of leading a proper life—it is all a question of price, of his idea of a proper life and the means of attaining it. Probably my idea of a proper life differs greatly from that of the majority of the members of the society, as does my notion of the means of attainment. I have for example no horror of the word "worldly," no desire to withdraw myself from the world. But I hold no brief against the society,—would not, were I gifted with all power, take one member from its ranks. Much of what I have said is applicable to my attitude toward all organized religion and in its emphasis upon this life may seem to many merely materialistic. Personally I do not so consider it. But whether it be or not, it is not possible to change opinions as one changes clothes to suit one's convenience. Yet, like clothes, opinions sometimes wear out. I have no such love for mine that I should greatly mourn their loss.

A. B.

THE PRACTICE OF THE PRESENCE OF GOD*

THERE is one aspect of the religious problem which is always well worth emphasizing; which cannot, in my opinion, be over emphasized or spoken of too frequently. This is what the old devotional books describe as the "Practice of the Presence of God."

We know of many kinds of religion. I do not mean different religious denominations, of which of course there are many hundreds. I mean different ways in which individuals manifest religion in their lives. Religion has been defined by the Rev. Percy S. Grant as man's relation to God, and this is as good a definition as any I know, of a thing which it is exceedingly difficult to define. So that we can say, to paraphrase our own statement, that there are many kinds of religion, that different people think differently of their relation to God; indeed, it would almost be true to say that every person thinks differently from every other person of his relation to God.

It is, however, not sufficient that we should have a merely formal relation to God, that we should carry out the observances of our form of religion whatever that may be. The Italian or Spanish brigand does this. He will go to his church and burn a candle on the altar of his favorite saint and pray fervently for the success of his next nefarious enterprise. The histories of the dark ages in Europe tell of the pirates who were the scourge of the Mediterranean that they nearly always had a priest on board their ships. They would go to confession and get absolution and hear mass before attacking one of the ships whose crew and passengers they intended to kill or sell into a slavery worse than death. Torquemada, who was at the head of the Spanish Inquisition when it was most powerful and most active, was a very devout and pious man. No one can read the histories of his time without being convinced of his good faith. He put indeed such a supreme value upon the soul that he was perfectly willing to imprison, torture and even burn his victims if he thought that by so doing he would further their eternal welfare.

Lest you should think that it is only in Catholic countries that we meet with these extravagant forms of religion I shall only have to mention the Protestant soldiers of the north who followed Gustavus Adolphus and Charles XII into northern Europe, and mixed up their

* An address delivered at the Chapel of the Comforter, New York, by a member of the New York Branch of the Theosophical Society.

religion and the killing of their fellow-men in the same astonishing manner. It is indeed only a few years ago that we had the extraordinary spectacle of a great and civilized nation setting aside a given day when all citizens of the country were requested to pray for the success of their armies and the confusion and destruction of their enemies, while the Boers were praying at the same time to the same God for success to *their* arms. It is evident that the mere outward observance of the forms of religion is not enough, no matter how faithful we may be in these. There must be a center of inspiration, of spiritual force and power in our being which will give us a constant tendency to do right. We must keep a reservoir of religious impulse in our consciousness so that at every instant of our lives there shall be available whatever amount is needed to freshen and enlighten our momentary acts. We must at every instant show in our lives the presence of this religious force, or else we shall surely go astray.

I think that without doubt this element is needed in our religion before we can feel sure that we are on the right track and that we are really living what is even an approximation of the true religious life; we must have in us a spiritual force which guides and directs and controls our actions and a spiritual insight which keeps us from such absurdities and extravagances as those to which I have referred. Now what is this force and insight and how can we cultivate them in ourselves? Most easily, I believe, by the Practice of the Presence of God; so I should like to tell you a little bit of what I understand the Practice of the Presence of God to mean.

Imagine with me for a moment, if you will, what would be the effect upon all of us if we suddenly had a vision of Jesus Christ standing here in this chancel, perhaps before the altar which is dedicated to his worship. A figure of transcendent majesty and power, of a beauty which it is impossible to describe in words, giving us all the feeling of His sympathy and helpfulness, with love and tenderness radiating from His face and eyes. Think what an effect this would have upon us. I do not think that anyone in this room would ever be quite the same after such a vision. We would carry the remembrance of it always. But let us go still farther. Suppose we could see Him with us always, walking through life with us from day to day, hour to hour, moment to moment, always at our elbow, seeing everything we did, hearing everything we said, knowing even our most secret thoughts to which we never gave utterance. Think what an effect this would have upon our conduct, how it would make us pause before we did anything wrong? Should we be able in the face of such a presence, even to say or do a rude or an unkind thing? How could we be cross if Christ heard our rough words? How could we fail to be polite, gentle, kind, well mannered, if Christ was always there to see. How could we post-

pone doing some duty if we knew that Christ was watching to see whether we would do it or not. Would it not be a spur to tired brain and weary hands? And in our work, whatever that might be, would not that constant Presence spur us on to our utmost endeavor? Would we not conquer disinclination, distaste, weariness, boredom? Should we not be ashamed to feel envy or malice or any uncharitableness? Think of the more important things of life—the poor man tortured by the temptation to drink. As he stood before the saloon door, would not the consciousness of the presence there of Christ give that needed stimulus to his will which would enable him to conquer his temptation and turn away? Or the poor woman of the streets who is forced to sell her body for daily bread. Would she not perhaps rather starve than make Christ a witness of her degradation? I can think of no state of life, none of the circumstances of life which would not be affected by such a conception, such a knowledge.

But it is not necessary to multiply instances. We know at once without argument or thinking, that if we actually saw Christ at our elbow, if we were actually conscious that he saw everything we did and knew everything we thought, this fact would have a wonderful and ever increasing effect upon our thoughts and actions. We know this. It does not admit of argument.

But the very curious thing about it is that this is just what does take place. We have been told again and again in every possible kind of words that God does know everything we do. That he is walking beside us day and night. If I were to ask each one of you whether you believed that God knew what you were doing and thinking, you would all answer, "Why, of course. God knows everything." Why then does it not have the wonderful effect upon our conduct which it ought to have? I think it is simply because we do not really believe it. That must be the explanation, for it is the only possible explanation which explains.

If it is true as we have been so often told, and if we do not really believe it, then the obvious thing to do is to cultivate the belief, to make ourselves to believe it; and this is what is meant by the Practice of the Presence of God. We must deliberately train ourselves to believe that God, or Christ if we prefer to picture God in the image of Christ, is always alongside of us. We must saturate our consciousness with that idea, must dwell upon it, think about it, imagine it and how we would act if we believed it, and gradually there will grow up in our consciousnesses the feeling that it is true; and then of course will follow the effects of its being true, the effects upon our conduct, upon our thoughts, upon our lives.

But this is not all. If we are to believe the Saints and Seers of old, those who have travelled this path and have left records of their

spiritual experiences for our information and instruction, a faithful adherence to this practice will result in several wonderful things. First we shall not only come to know that God is always with us in the intimate personal sense which I have described, but we shall come to actually feel His Presence, to absorb some of His power and glory which in turn will be reflected through us to all who come into contact with us. I believe that this is the first mark of saintship, that this is what distinguishes the saint from the ordinary man. People feel some of the power and glory of God as it is reflected in the man who has reached this point in the Practice of the Presence of God and they say to themselves, "That man is a saint."

There are still further stages, but it is hardly necessary for us to go into them, for they are far beyond our present reach. After learning to feel the Presence of God, the old records say that the saint actually comes to see Him, and in time to talk with Him. Some unknown spiritual faculty seems to open up the spiritual eyes and ears, and the saint has the kind of experience which St. Paul had on the road to Damascus, and before the judgment seat of Cæsar; the kind of experience which St. Francis of Assisi had and to which he referred when he called his favorite disciple Leo to his dying bedside and wished and prayed that he too should have the inestimable privilege which St. Francis had enjoyed, of face to face communion with Christ.

The lives of the Saints are full of such happenings and I have no doubt at all of their literal truth. We cannot all hope to reach such exalted stages of spiritual growth, but there is not a person in this room who cannot travel some distance on this road. No one here, no matter how young or how old, how poor or rich, how ignorant or how learned who cannot practice the Presence of God and get from so doing the inspiration, support and guidance which it will inevitably bring. And we can have for our comfort the saying in another of the old books, that a very little of this practice will deliver a man from great evil.

C. A. G., Jr.

"He that hath the word of Jesus truly can hear his silence also."

Ignatius of Antioch, *Eph.* 15.

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME

THE Gael was on the war-path. "You shirked the question of what constitutes perfect womanhood," he said. "I am speaking of the last *Screen*. You did not want to tread on corns. But people have no business to stick their feet out if they are hypersensitive; and a great many modern women stick their feet on chairs and tables. My similes are mixed; but that is my prerogative. I have no use for unbroken rhythm in similes. Nor have I any use for women who are ashamed of their sex. That is the trouble with suffragettes: they are ashamed of their womanhood—the sort of women who apologize for having babies. If men had them, too, such women would brag about their own superior ability to produce them. I hate their slavish adulation of the masculine. Imitation may be the sincerest form of flattery; but I would rather be a genuine ass than an imitation lion: and God did not intend women to be either asses or lions, but women. . . . What is my ideal of womanhood? That is unimportant. The question is, What is every woman's ideal of womanhood? My answer to that is that every woman would like to be *charming*. When she has given up all hope of being that, she demands a vote; not before. Morality? Why, of course! But that is included under charm. I am speaking of charm that endures. A woman should be as charming at fifty or sixty or seventy as when she was twenty. A selfish woman is never charming. A bad woman becomes hideous in short order. Only a woman who is a saint can fascinate you when she is seventy. . . . How can a woman make herself charming? It is quite simple. Cosmetics will not do it. The growth must take place from within. Did you ever see a real nun, a good nun, who was ugly? The saints were ravishingly beautiful. It is love that makes a woman beautiful; and love, in a woman means self-surrender. She must learn to give herself, without reserve, to—but that depends upon the woman. All nuns call themselves 'the brides of Christ.' They find their joy in suffering; their ecstasy on the Cross. But they do not suffer alone. The Cross is not a solitary place. There is no joy for man or woman in isolation. The outer solitude makes the interior companionship more vivid. They find the Beloved and they give themselves to Him. Read the Sufis. Do you not understand! There is no essential difference between marriage, properly understood, and life in a convent, properly understood—granting that a girl, a woman, has a real vocation for either. I do not mean that convent walls are necessary. Like St. Catherine of Siena, she can make a cell in her own heart. I know more than one 'nun' today, living in the world, mothers of children, women of fashion and culture.

"The truth is that a vocation is a most real and overwhelming

verdict, because it is a call from God; and, strange as it may sound, God calls to earthly marriage as often as to heavenly. Every woman is called to one or the other, although it does not necessarily follow that she has heard and obeyed the call."

The Buddhist was with us for the first time in months. He stopped the Gael at this point, gently as always, but with very fixed will.

"You omit motherhood," he said. "There are women called to motherhood, whose joy lies in motherhood, and, if you will not misunderstand me, they are not brides, they are mothers. You see this often in the married relation. But you see it still oftener in women who mother children not their own,—as teachers, for instance, or, in our villages, as women who nurse the sick, not professionally but by a sort of divine right. With us, such women think of Buddha as Father. They refer things to him, as a mother does to a father, finding immense joy in that companionship and communion. They are active rather than contemplative. Yet, the more deeply they enter into the spirit of motherhood, the more contemplative they become. The two paths meet at last."

"I agree with you," replied the Gael. "Motherhood also is a vocation. But a mother, whether in a home, in a school, in a hospital, or in a village, needs charm and ought to desire it as much as any other woman. She needs to win hearts and to be able to keep them in the name of and on behalf of Christ—as I would phrase it. My point is, however, that motherhood to some extent is still respected, even by women, while wifehood is not. Marriage today is cheapened, is prostituted. A girl's engagement should be regarded as a Probation, as a test of her vocation: has she been called by God to be the wife of that man? Will marriage to him bring both of them nearer to God, will it bring both of them to consciousness of their higher and immortal selves? That is the question. . . . Girls are no longer trained for it. They are brought up and educated to enable them to have 'a good time,' which is what their mothers wanted and have not had. And their mothers have not sense enough to see the cause of their own failure. Why take less seriously the vows of marriage than the vows of a nun? To perpetual celibacy a girl is admitted only after a long novitiate; after severe trial and test. To marriage, through the folly of her parents, a girl is admitted after a few months at her dressmakers. She knows nothing about herself and nothing about the man. Her relations with him have been more or less flighty and in any case quite superficial. 'Trial marriages'? For the love of heaven, no! But why not consult God; why not refer so serious and sacred a matter to some sacred and serious test? In India they at least consult the astrologers! Granting that, for practical purposes, the average of modern parents believe no more in God than they do in astrology, surely they might use their reason, intuition, imagination—whatever faculties they possess—to help

the girl to discover the truth: does she, can she love this man to the point of supreme self-abandonment, or is she thinking of marrying him for 'a good time,' or with the insane idea of 'lifting' him to where she herself is not?"

The Philosopher interrupted. "You have wandered from your point," he said. "You were going to tell us how a woman can become charming, or how a girl can be made charming. You have talked about everything except that. And you will be accused, if what you have said stand without correction, of attacking asceticism and in any case of placing marriage and celibacy on a par."

"I do not attack asceticism. It is a vocation. Happy the man or the woman so called. But a man may have just as real a vocation—may be called just as truly by God—to enter the army and to fight. Happy that man if he have ears to hear and the will to obey."

"It may seem contradictory and perverse," remarked the Student, before the Gael had taken breath; "but in my opinion women are the devil—not in themselves, but as embodying all the temptations of man. A man's lust of power, his lust for sensation, his ambition, his vanity—all the evil in him is aroused by women or by a woman; and the only safe course for him is to recognize that fact and to run whenever he feels their power. I would be perfectly fair about it. I do not in the least blame the women for this. Probably men are their devils, and probably the only safe course for women is to adopt the same attitude that I recommend to men. Buddha knew"—And the Student turned to the Buddhist—"Will you not quote for me?" "Do you refer to the incident recorded in the *Mahâ-Parinibbâna-Sutta?*

" 'How are we to conduct ourselves, Lord, with regard to womankind?'

" 'Do not see them, Ananda.'

" 'But if we should see them, what are we to do?'

" 'Abstain from speech, Ananda.'

" 'But if they should speak to us, Lord, what are we to do?'

" 'Keep wide awake, Ananda.'

"I have heard that quoted as showing the Buddha's sense of humour," continued the Student. "But it seems to me to prove his practical wisdom also."

"The humour of it is more significant than the wisdom," commented the Gael. "I should say that he knew his man. The questions explain the replies."

"What the Gael means," said the Philosopher, "is that your attitude and his own are reconcilable. There is no actual contradiction. If women, in a man's experience, arouse the evil in him, it is natural enough for him to regard them as instruments of Satan; and he is lucky if he has sense enough to see that and to act accordingly. His vocation in that case is probably to live as a celibate. It must be so while he feels

that way about it. Above all things, therefore, he should be true to his vocation. Yet we do not read that Buddha avoided women, or that Christ did. We do not find them complaining that women tempted them. One man's food may be another man's poison. And I confess that if I could not move among women without being tempted by them, I should, if only from respect for them, keep out of their way. Women are intended, whether as mothers, as sisters, as wives, or as friends, to help men to become the highest and best that lies latent in manhood; and I suspect that men are intended to serve women by being served, as well as by direct influence."

"The Student, quoting Buddha, is defending Monasticism"—this from the Gael. "And I do not think it needs defence—least of all on the ground which he suggests. I come back to my point: it is a question of *vocation*. No woman can be deeply happy, no woman's life can be complete, if she has failed to answer to her call. It does not matter to what kind of life a man or a woman is called. What does matter is, Who calls! Is it God who calls, or is it the Devil? Is it the Higher Self or the lower? It is fatal if that question be answered in haste. Always our conclusions should be tested. God would never call us away from our duty, from our responsibilities, from our obedience. Always we should ask ourselves whether we are prepared for more of pain than of pleasure. There are a hundred tests, and all should be applied: for nothing leads to greater misery than the self-deception which sees in immediate gratification the promise of life-long happiness."

"May I remind you," asked the Objector, "that you began by reproaching us with having shirked the question of womanhood's ideal and of how it can be attained? You have generalized about charm. You have declared that every woman in her heart desires to be charming: that that, though not the sum total of her ideal, must invariably be an essential part of it. So far you have merely been tantalizing, not to say cruel. If I were a woman (and devoid of humour), I might by this time be in an agony of suspense: how could I charm the Gael!"

"If you were a woman"—and the Gael laughed serenely—"if you were a woman, the Manvantara would need to be prolonged: for God Almighty would never let go of you until He had extracted your sting. I doubt whether men are so worth while. In no case, however, would you catch me suggesting methods for the increase of feminine charm. I leave that to the women themselves. And I am going to read you the advice of one of them—of one of the most charming women who ever lived, all the more so because the idea of it never entered her head. At first, I am not going to tell you who she was, and I am going to paraphrase her recommendations at certain points, for you can, if you choose, compare them later with the original. These rules I have translated from the French:

"1. The earth, even though fertile, unless it is cultivated, produces only brambles and thorns: so is it also with the spirit of woman.

"2. Speak well,—whether of things, or of persons,—particularly of other women.

"3. In the company of several, invariably speak but little.

"4. Be modest in all your words and actions.

"5. Never argue, least of all about matters of small importance.

"6. Moderate your gaiety. Never be boisterous. Never let your gaiety control you.

"7. Never ridicule anything whatsoever.

"8. Never reprove anyone except with discretion and humility, and with hidden shame on account of your own defects.

"9. Always accommodate yourself to the mood of those with whom you deal or communicate. Be gay with those who are gay, sad with those who are in trouble. In brief, make yourself all things to all people in order to win them.

"10. Never speak without having reflected on that which you are going to say, and without having submitted it to our Lord [if you be a Christian]; so that no word may escape you which would be displeasing to Him and unworthy of your ideal.

"11. Never excuse yourself,—unless there is great reason to do so.

"12. Never speak of that which might draw forth praise, such as your wisdom, your virtues, your family,—unless you have good reason to hope that to do so might be of service to others; and then it must be with humility, remembering that you hold all such gifts from the hand of God.

"13. Never exaggerate anything, but express your opinion and give your advice with moderation.

"14. In your speech and your interviews, always introduce something helpful or in any case kindly. In that way you will avoid useless chatter and scandal.

"15. Assert nothing without being certain of it.

"16. Never offer advice upon anything unless it is asked, or unless charity demands it.

"17. Whenever anyone talks of spiritual things, or of conduct, listen humbly, as a disciple listens to his master, and take for yourself whatever is said that is good.

"18. Disclose to your mother or to your father or to your spiritual director or to some older and trustworthy woman friend, all your temptations, your imperfections and your dislikes, so that they may give you counsel and may indicate remedies to overcome them.

"19. Treasure your solitude, and do not go out without an object: when obliged to go out, ask of God the grace to do nothing that will offend Him.

"20. Do not eat or drink except at regular hours, and be sure to offer heartfelt thanks to God.

"21. Do everything as if you actually saw our Lord beside you;

by means of this the soul acquires great treasures of merit and great beauty.

"22. Never listen to evil spoken of anyone, and never speak it, unless about yourself; when you take pleasure in doing so, you will advance rapidly, and will gain greatly in charm.

"23. Direct all your actions towards God and offer them to Him, asking that they be for His honour and glory.

"24. When you are happy, do not allow yourself to laugh immoderately, but let your gaiety be humble, modest, affable and sweet.

"25. Consider yourself every one's servant, seeing in each an immortal soul, or, if you choose, the person of Jesus Christ ["the Buddhist, there, can say Buddha," interjected the Gael]; thus you will have a great respect for your neighbors.

"26. Be always prompt in obedience, as if God were directing you through your parents or superiors.

"27. At every hour and with each of your actions, examine your conscience; then, after having recognized your faults, try, with the aid of God, to correct them. By this means you will arrive at perfection.

"28. Do not think of the faults of others, but of their virtues only, and of your special defects.

"29. Maintain in yourself always a great desire to suffer for our Lord, Jesus Christ, or for the ideal that you love, in everything and at all times.

"30. Make every day fifty offerings of yourself to God; make them fervently and with a lively desire so that they shall reach Heaven.

"31. Have before your eyes, during the day, the subject of your morning meditation; put a great deal of zeal and effort into this, and you will reap a rich harvest.

"32. Preserve most carefully the good inclinations with which God inspires you, and put into practice the good desires which He gives you in prayer.

"33. Avoid the unusual as much as possible, as it is always objectionable.

"34. Read frequently your rule of life and observe it faithfully.

"35. Admire the Providence and Wisdom of God in all creatures and in all events, and use each one as a means of praising Him.

"36. Detach your heart from slavery to external things; desire the ideal only and you will find it.

"37. Never show outwardly a devotion which you do not feel interiorly, though you may hide that which you really have.

"38. Do not exhibit your interior devotion without great necessity: 'My secret is my own.'

"39. Do not complain about your food, whether it is well or badly prepared: remembering the gall and vinegar which they offered to one more worthy than you are.

"40. When you are at table think more of courtesy and of the

pleasure of others than of your food. Keep your mind on the banquet of Heaven, and try to make it Heaven for those around you, as much for those who serve as for those who sit.

"41. Before your superiors, who are the persons in whom you should see the instruments of God, say only what is necessary and say it with great respect.

"42. Never do anything that you could not do before the whole world.

"43. Do not make comparisons between people, for comparisons are odious.

"44. When you are reprimanded on some point, receive the correction with real humility, both interior and exterior, and pray God for the person who has done it.

"45. When a superior (your parents, your teachers, your spiritual director, your employers) gives you an order, do not say that another has commanded something different, but believe that both had right intentions and do what you were told to do.

"46. Do not speak or inquire about things which do not concern you and are of no consequence to you.

"47. Hold your past failures in your mind and repent of them: think of your actual apathy, and of all that you lack to gain your ideal, so as to gain energy from fear, and resolution from your sense of wrongdoing.

"48. Do everything your companions ask you to do which is not contrary to your rule, and answer with humility and sweetness.

"49. Do not ask for favours or for exceptional treatment, unless it is actually necessary.

"50. Never cease to be humble and to correct yourself in everything until death.

"51. Accustom yourself to make frequently many acts of love, for they will enkindle and soften the soul.

"52. Also frequently practise the other virtues, methodically, giving special periods to each.

"53. Offer all your sufferings and all your joys to the Eternal Father, in union with the merits of the One whom you regard as perfect.

"54. Be kind to others and severe to yourself.

"55. On Saints' days think of their virtues and ask God to give them to you.

"56. Be careful each night to make the examination of your conscience thoroughly.

"57. When you act as superior, never reprimand anyone in anger, but wait until anger has passed; in this manner the correction will be useful.

"58. Apply yourself diligently to acquire perfection and devotion, and to do all things in this spirit.

"59. Reflect attentively upon the rapidity with which people change

and how insecure is the confidence we have in them; therefore, attach yourself directly to God, who does not change.

"60. Try to submit the things of your soul to an advisor who is learned and experienced in spiritual matters and to obey him in everything.

"61. When you are sad, or troubled, or anxious, do not, for that reason, abandon the good works and the prayers which you are accustomed to perform, for evil will not assail you until you abandon them; perform them more than before, and you will see how prompt the Lord will be to pour his favours upon you.

"62. Do not talk about your temptations and faults with those of your companions who are less advanced, as that will be as harmful to them as to you, but talk of them only to the most perfect.

"63. Remember that you have only one soul, and that you will die but once; that you, as that person, have but one life which is short and uncertain; that there is but one future which is eternal; and by this means you will avoid and turn from many things.

"64. Let your desire be to see God; your fear, to lose Him; your grief, that you do not yet possess Him; your happiness, that which takes you to Him; and you will live in great peace.'

"With very slight changes, and with the omission of four rules which are sectarian, that is the advice given by St. Theresa to her pupils. If you are in any doubt as to her charm, read a little book about her by May Byron, published by Hodder and Stoughton, in a series called "Golden Hours with the Saints." The price is about fifty cents. She was a fascinating woman, full of gaiety, of humour, of wisdom, of femininity. Her advice, of course, was intended for girls: but those who would enter the Kingdom of Heaven must become as little children—must regain the child-state they have lost. Perhaps, therefore, even older women could afford to take counsel from one so far above the average in experience and in self-understanding."

"Do you imagine," scoffed the Objector, "that any modern girl would be willing even to read such rules!"

"That depends," the Gael answered. "It depends upon her ambition, and upon her love of the beautiful. Can anything be less lovely or less loveable than the sort of girl you so often meet, whose characteristics are——

"That she talks incessantly about herself, of everything that she has done or has not done, about her family and about her plans, and who is happiest when everyone is talking about her;

"That she has a genius for turning the conversation into some praise of herself, and resents the praise of others, seeking opportunities to show others in a less favourable light, often repeating gossip and even slander;

"That she talks loudly, and loves to command others;

"That she always imagines herself to be in the right, and is incapable of accepting a rebuke without self-defence or angry protest;

"That she complains constantly of all things to everyone who will listen to her, except to God, unless they are exactly in accordance with her taste;

"That she is avid of sensation, of news; that she likes to be singular in everything, independent of everyone, unhampered by duty;

"That she will work with incredible energy to get what she wants or to accomplish what she desires, but becomes languid whenever her own choice and taste are not given preference;

"That she abandons her religion or her religious exercises as soon as they cease to amuse or to console her;

"That she thinks of pleasure, of riches, of honours, of health as the only real blessings; that her ideals are dreams of prominence and of power and of the adulation of herself by men and of the envy of herself by women;

"That she is invariably agitated, either to the point of being depressed or to the opposite point of being feverish, oscillating between the two extremes;

"That she generates a new desire every day and is never satisfied when she obtains it. Her affections are as spasmodic as her desires. She chooses her friends according to their approval of herself. Those whom she feels to be superior to herself, she abominates.

"That she resents suffering of any kind and is horribly afraid of death;

"That she is self-centered, self-willed, vain, foolish—an infliction.

"Does she want to avoid that condition; to become, instead, a thing of beauty and a joy forever? She might do worse, in that case, than make the rules of St. Theresa her own. For no matter what her vocation may be, she will be unable to discover it so long as she seeks to please herself only; and, if her vocation be marriage, she is predoomed to marry the wrong man unless she seeks guidance from God and has learned, at least to some extent, to hear and to obey that guidance. No man is sufficient unto himself; nor is any woman. We need the help of others, older and wiser than we are; and a girl who very properly may object that to be certain of God's will is difficult and sometimes is impossible, should remember that her parents or guardians or older relatives have been given to her by God as in some sense His representatives. To them she should be entirely frank; trusting them to help her. . . .

"The ideal of womanhood, you ask! I have at least suggested what it is not. I have even ventured to quote a woman on the subject of its attainment. But each woman must answer the main question for herself, just as each man must do. It is *her* ideal that she must seek; *her* ideal that she must live to become. If she be true to that, she will find at last in the eyes of another, whether of God or of man, that vision of further heights, of more perfect self-surrender, which she can never gain alone, but which, once seen, will be for her the Gleam to follow forever."

T.

ELEMENTARY ARTICLES

The New Trend in Science and Philosophy

FORTY years ago and long after, religion had in science and philosophy powerful and persistent opponents. The trend of thought at that time was entirely opposed to the spiritual, and a whole generation of young people grew up with the conviction that Science and Religion were eternal foes. Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall and Romanes were great men and great Scientists, but their teaching and influence came like a tidal wave submerging old landmarks and, apparently laying in ruins the very foundations of all religion. In 1869 a number of these men met at the home of the editor of the *Nineteenth Century,* and at that meeting Huxley suggested the word *"Agnostic,"* as a theological term. At that time the scientists had a great deal to say about the bigotry of theologians, but they were far more arrogant than the theologians, and with great confidence asserted that the rushlight of Christianity had gone out before the sun of Science. It was freely stated, and with the authority of popes, that no man of intelligence could be a Christian, and that all who professed to hold the old faith were either old women or cowards. In their teaching the scientists became more dogmatic than the churches, and did not hesitate to say that the universe—organic and inorganic—could be perfectly interpreted by the laws of Mechanics. This, of course, swept away the most familiar and necessary ideas of religion. Dr. Ernest Haeckel in his *New Genesis* said "The real maker of the organic world was in all probability an atom of carbon, a tretrahedron made up of four primitive atoms. The human soul is only the sum of these physiological functions whose elementary organs are constituted of the microscopic ganglion cells of the brain. Consciousness is a mechanical work of the ganglion cells, and as such must be carried back to chemical and physical events. From this it follows (1) that belief in an immortal soul as inhabiting the body during life and leaving it at death is an exploded superstition. And (2) that there is no such thing as personal immortality, for the only soul man possesses disappears when the nervous mass decomposes."

Haeckel repeated this in 1892, and three years later it was translated into English as *The Confession of Faith of a Man of Science.* In this, however, Haeckel stands almost alone among scientific men

today, as one may judge by a reading of Sir Oliver Lodge's informing book on *Life and Matter*. In the preface of this book the author says, "The book is especially intended to act as an antidote against the speculative and destructive portions of Professor Haeckel's interesting and widely read work." From 1870 to 1890 Agnosticism was fashionable and wielded a great power over multitudes of people. Those of us who came in contact with these great personalities are not surprised at the wonderful influence they exerted in giving a trend to modern thought. Take a man like Professor George J. Romanes who seemed to throw a magic spell over the students of his day, many of whom followed him out of the Christian faith into materialism, but did not come back as he did. He published a very charming little book whose arguments were never answered until he answered them himself after his conversion. This little book, *A Candid Examination of Theism, by Physicus,* declared that it was impossible for him to believe in the existence of a God and the immortality of the Soul because their reasonableness could not be demonstrated to his own intellectual satisfaction. And further that the idea of God was altogether unnecessary to the explanation of the universe, and also that the idea of a future life was a dream unverified by facts.

The marvellous development of knowledge and the growing power of man over nature, together with the rapid accumulation of wealth fascinated the modern mind and it became so completely absorbed in the present world as to lose all interest in any other. It was boastingly said that Huxley, Tyndall, Spencer, and Haeckel had said the last word upon human existence, and that word had disposed forever of religion and the spiritual world. Thus the message of religion was despised and neglected by tens of thousands of cultured people and the trend of thought became fully set against the spiritual.

It was at this point that Madame Blavatsky appeared and with a whip of scorpions scourged the backs of the materialists. Intellectually she was equal to the strongest and most brilliant of these men, and they were irritated—some of them were exasperated—by the fact that a *woman* should talk to them after such a fashion. Some of their replies were quite unscientific and far from being chivalrous. It is true that some of H. P. B.'s language seemed to be too strong and was lacking in discrimination and, like all over-statements, created a feeling of resentment in many minds,—so stirring up needless antagonism. At least, that is the impression that one gets from reading her words today in *Isis Unveiled, Secret Doctrine* and the early numbers of *Lucifer*. Of course it will remain a matter of personal opinion as to whether such methods were necessary or whether it was a manifestation of the weakness of a strong woman. To those of us who knew the men, they did not seem so black as she painted them, but they did have their limitations both of knowledge and insight. Take Tyndall, for example,

who was highly respected by all who knew him, not only for his remarkable literary qualities, but for the elevation of his aims and the steadfastness of his devotion to his life work. He was an apostle of verification and persistently tried to "prove all things and hold fast that which is good." As a seeker of the truth he seemed to be thoroughly in earnest, and as a teacher perfectly candid. Then, too, it is only fair to remember that during all this dogmatic, agnostic period not all great scientists were sceptical or agnostics. For a while their voices were drowned by those of the orthodox scientists, but later they were heard. Sir William Thompson—afterwards Lord Kelvin—made some discoveries as to the atom that completely upset the old mechanical theories: the molecular theory demonstrated that the atom itself was made up of electrons—little points of electricity, and that these were probably specks of ether, and that the matter thought of by Huxley and Tyndall did not really exist. Arguing for an invisible consciousness back of matter he boldly stated that, "Fourier's equation for the flow of heat required a beginning, an initiation;" and further, that "the permanence of the atom as a vortex of motion could not be produced by any known animate or inanimate agency." By many people Lord Kelvin was considered to be the greatest man of science since Sir Isaac Newton, and all agreed that he was a noble, lovable, humble and beautiful character. Through him the attitude of science toward religion began to change, for he was a devout and consistent Christian. Then came the conversion of Romanes, which was a wonderful thing. Romanes was a candid seeker after the truth and lived to prove the words of Jesus, that "He that seeketh shall find." At the time that he wrote his little book, *A Candid Examination of Theism,* he declared that he was not happy in his position; that instead of the God of the universe that he believed in as a boy there seemed nothing but a great, big, empty hole: and therefore he was constantly seeking light on that problem. One day as he was studying a little piece of life under the microscope, he suddenly paused. The conviction took hold upon him that there was some sort of intelligence back of the physical force in this piece of life. So he asked himself the question, "Since Science demands experience as the basis of all human belief, is there not somewhere within the range of experience some evidence of an intelligent power directing physical forces?" Immediately he thought of the human will, "I wish to lift my hand; my hand goes up. I wish to walk out of this room; my body walks out. What is it? It is the directing power of a conscious intelligence." Then he remembered a statement may by A. R. Wallace, another great scientist. Wallace said, "The only knowledge that man possesses in the realm of human experience of any power to direct physical forces is the knowledge of the human will; and that the human will is of the nature of spirit." Facing these facts honestly and realizing the uniformity of law and the unity of nature, Romanes was compelled to recognize the fact that the

directing, controlling power back of the physical forces in the universe must be a self-conscious intelligence akin to the human will. So he woke up to the fact that he had been neglecting certain great and fundamental facts in the realm of human experience. This was in 1890, when Romanes was carrying on a discussion with A. R. Wallace and others in the pages of his magazine—*Nature*—about certain Darwinian problems. The man who was contributing the most important articles to this discussion was John J. Gulick—an American Congregational Missionary, then at Osaka, Japan. In this year, 1890, Romanes prefaced one of Gulick's articles with these words, "I believe it is my duty to say that in my judgment this man brings the most profound intellect of our time to this discussion of Darwinian problems." On Christmas Day of 1890 he wrote to Gulick a personal letter, and this led to a most interesting correspondence which ended in the complete conversion of Romanes to the Christian faith. He joined the Anglican Church and died a member of that communion.

Thus Science has been sobered by its own discoveries and is no longer dogmatic but wishes to be relieved from pronouncing on any of the ultimate problems of life. The great men of Science to-day are Christians. I do not mean that they have accepted the old dogmatic statements, or the ecclesiastical explanation of things, but they have a deeper perception of the facts of religious experience, a deeper realization of the part which religion plays in human life, and a great many of them, like Sir Oliver Lodge, are members of Christian Churches, and those who are not associated with churches show a spirit of reverence toward the religious side of life and reject the explanation of religious phenomena offered by Science thirty years ago. A majority of these men agree that the mechanical explanation of the universe has entirely broken down. Professor Mach in his *Science of Mecanics* says, "The science of mechanics does not comprise foundations, no, nor even a part of the world, but only an aspect of it." And again in another place, "The faith and hope that the physical universe was fully described in mechanical terms, which prevailed in scientific circles a generation ago, are now pretty well played out. On these lines nothing can be explained."

In the realm of philosophy, too, if we have the time and patience to follow its latest teaching we find ourselves in the presence of a new movement where the old system and the old aphorisms have entirely broken down. Philosophy that had lost itself in abstract thought has now strangely turned round and says that the position from which we must start is not force but intuition. Dr. Robert Horton of London has said that people hardly notice the thinker when he comes into the world, but he always dominates the world and directs the course of human progress; indeed it is thought that makes progress. Philosophy like Science has become strangely humble, yet through this humility is learn-

ing to see, and today has clearer insight than for a generation past. Philosophy and Science in different ways assure us of one clear truth, namely, that the explanation of things must be sought in the Spiritual World. With this decisive change in the whole trend of modern thought a new era has opened, and it will not be long before religion and culture will be closest friends and helpers, so that "Mind and soul, according well, may make one music as before." Three of the greatest men in the world of philosophy today are examples of this newer thinking. Dr. Horton has called Eucken "the greatest modern thinker," but I think that on a par with him we may place Bergson of France and McDougall of England. Since the passing of William James, America has no outstanding man in the world of philosophy. Professor Rudolph Eucken is lecturing at Harvard as exchange professor from Germany, but I hope that many other cities besides Boston may have the pleasure of seeing and hearing him.

McDougal is an English teacher in the University of Oxford, and has written a book on *Body and Mind*. By the strictest investigation, scientific and psychological, he has been driven to adopt the belief in the soul; and then he finds that the soul explains and irradiates human life and the possibilities of mankind.

Bergson is a great French philosopher and a most brilliant writer. The trend of his thought is the same as that of McDougal. His starting point is the criticism of the mechanical explanation of life, and his effort to show that this mechanical explanation does not avail. The great reality is life expressing itself in every department of the universe. The absolute reality is life, that is God; it is the great present working and eternal reality. Not physics, nor mechanics, not matter but life—God.

Perhaps Eucken is the most popular of the three, and while I cannot go into detail as to his teaching I can give the closing paragraph of his book *Can We Yet be Christians*. "Our question was whether we could today still be Christian. Our answer is that we not only can, but must be. But we can only be so if Christianity is recognized as a movement in the flow of the world's history, if it is rescued from ecclesiastical torpidity and placed upon a broader foundation. Here, then, lies the task of our time and the hope of the future."

This marvelous change in the trend of thought during one lifetime should be an inspiration to us all. The science and philosophy that has forsaken the material, declaring the old Scripture true, that, "The things that are seen are transient but the things not seen are eternal," may yet come to see that intuition can be so trained that it can wring from nature great truths that it has taken intellect centuries to win and which, even yet, it is not sure of. Let us be content to wait, for the Wisdom Religion holds all that Science and Philosophy can ever discover.

JOHN SCHOFIELD.

REVIEWS

Theosophy and Christian Dogmatics. The Protestant Episcopal Church of America has greater catholicity, perhaps, than some of the extreme forms of Protestantism. But it is ~~often~~ very untheosophic in its exclusiveness. It maintains, sometimes, an arrogant and supercilious attitude toward "sectarian bodies," and refuses to admit them under the designation "Church." It declares that by schism, if not heresy, these "organizations" have cut themselves off from the body of faithful believers. In view of this exclusive and supercilious attitude of the Episcopal Church, it is a surprise, but rather a joy, to know, that for more than twenty years, the Episcopal theological schools of America have used as a text book in the important subject of dogma, a volume that is written by a Lutheran, namely the volume entitled *Christian Dogmatics,* by the Lutheran Bishop, Martensen, of Denmark. Why, one may ask, should such a choice be made, out of the thousands of theological books that are at the service of seminaries? Martensen is a Dane. His book passed into German before being translated into English. The scholars of the English Church could have translated Latin and Greek theologians as easily as this modern Dane. Why might not a sort of eclectic text book have been prepared, made up of extracts from the Church fathers? On the surface of things, it is not easy to explain the widespread use of Bishop Martensen's volume. It is well planned and orderly. But, above all, it is philosophical. And its philosophy gets into it from its author's study of Theosophy.

Martensen was born in 1808. For a time he was professor of philosophy. In 1854 he was made Bishop. As a young man he was interested in medieval mysticism, especially in Eckhart and Tauler, and it was his wish to write a scholarly account of the mystics. His reading of mystical writers brought him to Jacob Boehme. Boehme, at first, repelled him, but afterwards won such sympathetic interest, that Martensen contemplated writing a book that should expound and criticise Boehme's views. But the active duties of his vocation interfered. As theologian, Martensen wrote his two volumes, one on *Christian Ethics,* and the other, that has been mentioned, on *Christian Dogmatics.* Then, after winning a place as champion of the Lutheran cause, he, late in life, returned to the subject that had early attracted him, and published a volume of *Theosophical Studies* that centre on the life and teaching of Boehme. Martensen died in 1884. His works were early translated into English. The translator's preface to *Christian Dogmatics* is dated 1866.

Did Martensen learn Theosophy from Christianity, or Christianity from Theosophy? Each seems to have contributed toward the other. His sympathy with mysticism prepared him for something more than an historical or moral interpretation of the Master's life and teaching. He sought to apprehend in it a cosmical meaning, to prove that it is significant for the entire universe, that "the principles of Christianity are identical with those by which the world itself subsists, and on which the foundation of the world is laid." This conviction as to the universal significance of Christianity led him to a serious consideration of metaphysical teaching about Deity and its manifestations; his theology was thus greatly enriched.

Within the Unity of God he discerns an Eternal Duality, a divine subject and a divine substance. The *fatherly pleroma,* he writes, reveals itself in the Son as a kingdom of ideas, while through the Spirit, the eternal possibilities are present before the face of God as magical realities, as a heavenly host of visions, of plastic archetypes for a revelation *ad extra.* Again, in the theosophical writings of Boehme, Martensen was confronted with a *living intuition of nature;* he saw that Boehme was struggling to apprehend the God of Revelation as the Living God, and to know all Nature as in God. The grandeur of that idea led Martensen to an exposition of the Creation (according to Genesis) that has nothing in common with the childish, mechanical, Judaic teaching, but which is permeated by what we call the doctrine of Evolution. The world, he says, has both a natural and a super-natural (he uses this word in its good sense) beginning. The natural beginning is the relative, the finite one, which is split up into sporadic variety. The world is, in this sense, *natura, an organism developing itself.* But this *natura* has its beginning in the creative will of the *logos.* And it is that creative will which causes to issue forth the entire variety of vital forces. So that, in this sense, the world is *creatura,* a continuous revelation of divine will.

Belief in a process of evolution runs through Martensen's theology. In writing of the Fall of Man, he shows how the Church failed to distinguish between innocence and sanctity or perfection. Adam was merely innocent. That is, there was in Adam the living beginning of a true relation to God, the possibility of a progressive development. Adam's vocation was, and is, sanctity, the perfectness of the Father. Martensen speaks of sanctity as a "self-acquired attribute of humanity." Man is driven from the Garden of Eden in order that he may find the way to the Kingdom of Heaven. Martensen views man as a microcosm, hence he finds in him a correspondence with the *natura* and *creatura* aspects of the universe. It is the finite, the lower, nature of man that "falls."

"Although man, in virtue of his actual will, may fall from God, according to his *essential* will, in the innermost kernel of his freedom, he is indissolubly united to the divine logos as the holy world-principle."

There are two aspects of the Incarnation also, the cosmical and the redemptive. Such an explanation of the Incarnation as Martensen's is startling to one who has all his life been accustomed to the legal aspect of the Atonement, which was foisted on the Church by a school of unimaginative Carthaginian theologians. The scheme of redemption, Bishop Martensen maintains, is subordinate in the Incarnation, and is no part of the original plan. The chief and original purpose of the Incarnation is a cosmical one—to *complete* and *perfect.* The *logos,* by which all things were made that are made, purposed a self-revelation when the times should be ripe; that revelation of the highest good cannot be viewed as a mere *means* toward something else but must be looked upon as *its own end.* In other words, the Bishop declares that the Incarnation was a necessity but that the Crucifixion was not, and he quotes the old proposition: *Etiam homo non pecasset, deus tamen incarnatus esset, licet non crucifixus.* The Fall of Man affected no eternal truth or idea. The eternal ideal for man remained the same, but the way to the ideal became different.

The section of *Christian Dogmatics* that discusses the Sacraments shows again theosophic influence. The chapters on Baptism and the Communion show an apprehension of the idea that was uppermost in St. Paul's mind—which St. Paul most explicitly stated when he wrote to the Galatians: "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you." Christ is the second Adam or new man, and the importance of the Sacraments is their part in the formation and growth of this new creature who is more than the self-conscious man. "By baptism man is incorporated into the new Kingdom, and the possibility of, the necessary requirements for, the new personality are given therein." The

Communion brings to growth and perfection the germ of new life implanted by Baptism. "The Lord's supper is not only an aliment for the soul (*cibus mentis*) but an aliment for the whole new-man, for the future man of the Resurrection, who is germinating and growing in secret, and who shall be manifested in glory, in exact likeness with the glorified humanity of his Lord. . . . And as we seek a literal interpretation of the words, 'Take, eat, this *is* my body, this *is* my blood,' there here presents itself a pattern or model from the kingdom of nature, the first creation. In bread and wine, viewed merely as natural means of nourishment, it is not the natural materials as such which do in reality strengthen and nourish, but the invisible *power* which lies hid therein, the creating power which we also call the *blessing*. For the blessing implies the fact that the creative principle is present secretly, even in the gifts of nature. Heathenism itself said that Ceres and Bacchus were present in bread and wine, and that mankind partook even of Ceres and Bacchus in the forms of bread and wine, *i. e.*, that the real eating and drinking was not a mere eating and drinking of the outward material, but a being made partaker of the creative principle itself, as that which truly strengthens and stimulates. But in revealed religion we know that the Son, the divine logos, is the creative principle in the whole kingdom of nature, that the secret power of life, in all the gifts of nature, is the power of the Son of God, who fills all things. The creative logos it is who gives us bread and wine, and even in the kingdom of nature we, as it were, hear Him say, 'Take, eat, this is I, this is my being, my creative and sustaining power of life, which you are made to partake of through bread and wine, and which is in these elements, truly nourishing, strengthening, and life-giving.' 'I would never desire to drink thereof,' said Master Eckart, 'if there were not something of God within it.'"

Enough has been quoted, I hope, to prove that the volume *Christian Dogmatics* evidences a religion lighted by philosophy, and quite different from the hard material dogmatism that held the field in 1875. Martensen's work was done before the Lodge messenger brought to us again in 1875 the truths we cherish. It is by no means the wish to convey an impression that Bishop Martensen is such a theologian as was Origen or Synesius, or that he views Christianity as a devout member of the T. S. to-day would do. But his book shows an insight into Christianity that is rare. And as it is used by many young students, the hope rises in one that the Church may, through it, come more quickly to realize the hidden wisdom of God.

In the volume on Jacob Boehme, entitled *Theosophical Studies,* Martensen quite naturally considers Theosophy as a system of philosophy, and criticises it from that view-point. But, he also sees that it is much more than a metaphysical system—that it is a life. And for that perception and his sympathetic record of it, theosophists and the T. S. owe him gratitude.

"Theosophy is, as St. Martin and Franz Baader so often repeat, a philosophy of prayer. This personal life in God, as the qualification for philosophizing, is very frequently emphasized by Boehme. He admonishes all who desire to peruse his writings, that they must not do so with naked if never so acute speculation (which seeks only abstract knowledge devoid of religious and ethical interest), because in this spirit they must remain outside them, and will only succeed in catching a glimpse of one detail and another, of no kind of utility in themselves, but only to make a boast of. He writes only for the children of God and for sincere seekers; for to such alone belongs the pearl. For his own part, he has often prayed God that He would take this knowledge from him, unless it might tend to the Divine glory and to the edification of himself and his brethren. He testifies that, from the outset, he did not seek to know anything concerning the Divine mysteries. He has, from the first, sought only the Heart of Jesus Christ, that he might there hide himself from the wrath of God and the malice of the

devil. Then met him the gracious Maiden from Paradise. And first he must needs pass through the world, and the Kingdom of Hell. This gracious Maiden, who plays so great a part in his apprehension of God, is the Eternal Idea, the precious Sophia, the heavenly Wisdom, who not only reveals to him the Divine mysteries, but espouses his soul, reforms him by leading him to God and Christ, consoles him in all his anxiety and distress, and conducts him to peace and salvation."

ALFRED WILLISTON.

*The Revolutions of Civilisation,** by the famous Egyptologist, W. M. Flinders Petrie, is an exceedingly interesting little book that has a special significance for students of Theosophy. Mr. Petrie has used his unique acquaintance with the peoples of the past to make some new observations about civilizations as a whole. He says that we now have enough reliable knowledge of the past to be able to study the phenomena of civilization over a period of twelve thousand years. During that time there have been eight distinct civilizations, which rose, flowered and decayed in an astonishingly similar manner and in practically a like number of years. We can see and study the life cycle of a civilization as before we could only study the individual or the race. This life cycle lasts from 1,300 to 1,500 years, and follows a uniform and almost invariable course. First there is a comparatively rapid development from savagery, lasting from 150 to 200 years. The new civilization first produces good sculpture. About 150 years later it produces painting; 150 years more, literature; 200 years mechanics; 150 years science and wealth; then comes inevitable degeneracy and a return to a chaos in which the dying civilization is replaced by a new one brought from the East by a new people. The new civilization always comes from the East to the West and the Eastern phase is about 450 years ahead of the Western phase.

Contrary to general opinion the only improvement that can be noted during these 12,000 years is in the quantity of civilization, not in its quality. In quality we moderns have not reached the level of several of the older civilizations. No sculpture has been equal to the Greek; no building equal to the Egyptian and Greek. Art as a whole was as good in the fourth, sixth and seventh civilizations as in the eighth. But the various good phases last a little longer now than they used to, and that is the only noticeable gain.

The life history of a civilization from the point of view of government follows an invariable course. First there is strong, personal rule, lasting from four to six centuries. Then an oligarchy, when leadership is still essential, but the unity of a country can be maintained by law. This lasts from four to six centuries. Then comes a gradual transformation to a democracy, which is usually co-eval with the literary phase, lasting about four centuries. Wealth gradually increases during this period, until democracy has attained full power. Then the majority without wealth, eat up the capital of the minority, and the civilization steadily decays, until the inferior population is swept away to make room for a fitter people. Remember this is not a *theory,* but is what has actually happened, in every civilization, in all parts of the world, eight times during the 12,000 years of which we have knowledge. It is absolutely the best argument against socialism that I have ever read, for in the light of history it is clear that to advocate socialism is to advocate the dying stage of our civilization.

But this study has other very interesting side-lights. It is always the nation that strives hardest that goes highest and lasts longest. There is no advance without strife. It may be the strife of ideas and personalities, for these will keep a nation vigorous as well as the strife of arms, but strife, struggle, necessity for action, these must be. The easier life is rendered the sooner decay sets in.

* Harper and Brothers, London and New York.

It is, however, when the author begins to discuss the possible reasons for the extraordinary evenness of the periods of civilizations, and the remarkable way in which each of the great departments of human activity rise to the front at about the same period in the life time of each civilization, last about the same length of time, and are succeeded by the next, that the subject is of special interest to the student of Theosophy. Mr. Flinders Petrie's best explanation is that when races overrun each other, and there always is a mixture of races at the beginning of each new civilization, it takes about 800 years for a thorough mixture of blood to take place. Hence the height of a civilization is about 800 years after its birth. He says that in 800 years we have a hundred million ancestors, therefore each individual in a race would have some of the blood of every member of the parent races in his veins. It may be so. But is not the statement of Master K. H. in *The Occult World,* that the average period between incarnations is from 1,200 to 1,500 years, much more suggestive? Petrie shows that the average life of civilizations is 1,350 years. The average of "from 1,200 to 1,500" is 1,350. It is the same group of egos, coming back into incarnation, at about the same time that produce the same results. Every 1,350 years we have the pioneers of a new civilization incarnating to start a new civilization: then come the sculptors, the painters, the writers the mechanics, the scientists and finally the merchants, whose very success paves the way for the degenerate egos whose laziness and lack of virility bring about decay. The thing proves itself.

JOHN BLAKE.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 146.—*What is the Theosophical teaching about the life of Christ? Is he to be taken literally? Did he mean what he said? Did he mean us, if we are disciples, to do what he did and live as he taught his disciples to live? Please answer directly without hedging.*

ANSWER.—I have the impression that to fulfil the querent's injunction not to hedge, I must needs give answers as direct and uncompromising as the questions themselves.

Is Christ to be taken literally? Yes.

Did he mean what he said? Yes.

Did he mean his disciples (ourselves if we be such) to live and do as he did? Yes.

And yet what meaning may these brief and direct replies have given? Surely they require explanation; and I cannot see but what almost any effort at explanation may be taken as "hedging." For example: Christ is indeed to be taken literally, and yet that literalness must be of a spiritual kind. In other words, we must follow literally the *spirit* of his life and teaching, not lose ourselves in the letter. Because Christ wore his hair long, dressed in white and flowing garments, went barefoot, all in conformity with his time and country, it does not follow in the least that we too should wear long hair, white garments, and go shoeless. It *does* show the value of conformity, however,—of the simple acceptance of outward conditions as we find them prepared for us; the willingness, so far as circumstances go, to adapt ourselves to our time and our surroundings, and to turn the force of our life into the things of the inner world, as Christ did. He did not neglect the outer world, he accepted it. But in it he found the radiance of the spiritual world, and he lived in that radiance, and strove to make it manifest by precept and example. He himself was the light shining in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended him not.

The social and political conditions of his day he entirely ignored: his only political utterances were—to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and his re-iterated statement that his kingdom was not of this world, proclaiming to Pilate, when he stood as a malefactor before him, "Thou sayest that I am,—a King." "The letter killeth and the spirit giveth life." Only as we follow literally the spirit of his life and teaching, what he said and what he did, can we be considered in any sense to be following him. The actual, physical act or word was but the outward symbol of the spirit, altering with each age and place, and ephemeral as a flower.

With marvellous poetic tenderness he touched even these passing things, leaving upon them an immortality of beauty, as he fashioned them to his own use in illustration and parable. He made them conveyers of his message. And so another great lesson is borne home to us, that all life is a symbol, and that each manifested detail of it should be so used by us,—used for deep spiritual purposes, and to convey the eternal truth within.

Also we see thereby that the two lives cannot be divorced, the inner and the outer: they are in reality the same. But again the spirit determines; in it alone lies the germ of life; without it the symbol is dead, and stares at us like the shutterless windows of a deserted house.

Thus to follow the life and teaching of Christ is to take them literally. Yet, blindly to follow the word without regard to its spiritual significance, is completely to disregard all that he represents. He bade us forsake all to follow him, and how complete this renunciation must be, it is evident that only those who have made themselves his high disciples can realize, when the last vestige of self-love and self-seeking have been torn from the heart. So, too, we are told that "he that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me." Does this mean lack of filial love and respect and obedience—when his last human act upon the Cross was a provision for the care and love for his own mother which he could no longer give? Does "forsake all" mean that we shall part with the burden and responsibility of our wealth, when the parable bids us double our talents and return to the giver of them with usury? In all time men have been willing to surrender everything except their own wills; and so they have cried Lo! here and Lo! there, as the Master said they would; and few indeed have found that strait and narrow gate of self-renunciation.

But read in that light and *in that light alone,* the life and teaching of Christ are as plain and simple as the daylight, present no problems, show no contradictions; and no other interpretation ever has or ever will prove satisfactory. We are superficial in our literalness, if the truth be told. We try to make bargains with God, calling them his; but God never bargains, and is silent at our railings against his refusal of contracts. He gave us free-will and has been true to that gift in the limitations imposed. The path is open and free, but there is no coercion to walk in it. Indeed he will not accept us until we come to him willingly.

Perhaps all this is "hedging," though an honest effort to be quite simple and direct has been made. But after all the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven are mysteries save for the disciples themselves; to the multitude even the great Master himself was obliged to speak in parables, because of their lack of understanding, and the hardness of their hearts. A special maturity is needed for certain kinds of comprehension. There are things I cannot tell a child no matter how much I may desire to do so. When we repent and become as little children, we recognize this momentous distinction, and so have made the first step towards obtaining the knowledge that we seek. For then we shall strive to "grow up" in the spiritual life as simple obedient children will, and in that atmosphere, and in that atmosphere alone, our powers and faculties will develop.

"He who is perfected in devotion findeth spiritual knowledge springing up in himself in the progress of time."

CAVÉ.

QUESTION 147.—*In the* Voice of the Silence *I read that the mind is the slayer of the real. Yet surely Masters must have minds, and they have given us much that we must use our minds to understand. Is the mind a hindrance to the theosophic life?*

ANSWER.—The Masters do not have "minds" in our usual sense of the term: they have purified Manas, which is a transmitter and reflector of the Real, not a deflector and "slayer" of it.

This, of course, is but another way of saying that in them lower Manas has

been transformed into Higher, which is accomplished by using Buddhi (Spiritual Will) to suppress ordinary mental domination and self-identification with it.

CAVÉ.

QUESTION 148.—*Do the statements made in Genesis ii, 17 and 19 coincide with the Theosophical Teaching as regards the building of the physical man?*

ANSWER.—Mme. Blavatsky writes (*The Path,* April, 1888, Note on page 2): "The first chapter of Genesis, or the Elohistic version, does not treat of the creation of man at all. It is what the Hindu Puranas call the *Primal* creation, while the second chapter is the *Secondary* creation or that of our globe of man. Adam Kadmon is no *man,* but the *protologos,* the collective Sephirothal Tree—the 'Heavenly Man,' the *vehicle* (or Vahan) used by En-soph to manifest in the phenomenal world (see Sohar): and as the 'male and female' Adam is the 'Archetypal man,' so the animals mentioned in the first chapter are the *sacred* animals, or the zodiacal signs, while 'Light' refers to the angels so called. *Genesis* being an Eastern work, it has to be read in its own language. It is in full agreement, when understood, with the universal cosmogony and evolution of life as given in *The Secret Doctrine* of the Archaic Ages. The last word of Science is far from being uttered yet. Esoteric philosophy teaches that man was the first living being to appear on earth, all the animal world coming *after* him." This explains why the seventh verse of the second chapter of Genesis records the creation of man's physical body, while the formation of the physical bodies of the animals is narrated only in the nineteenth verse. The whole subject is treated in great detail in *The Secret Doctrine,* ii, 180 (Edition of 1888).

C. J.

QUESTION 149.—*It is all very well to quote distant Finland, in discussing "Votes for Women," as does the writer of the "Notes and Comments" in the October* QUARTERLY. *But is not the experience of this country altogether favorable, in the States where Equal Suffrage has been tried?*

ANSWER.—Not altogether satisfactory. Witness the following:

"'THE WOMEN HAVE LOST.'

"To the Editor of The New York Times:

"May I enter a protest against the news head-lines of suffrage victories? Invariably this news is headed 'The Women Have Won.' Say rather 'A Few of the Women Have Won' or 'The Political Women Have Won' or 'The Suffragists Have Won.' As a matter of facts, the majority of women have lost. In all this hue and cry over suffrage the thing that impresses me most is the injustice of forcing a vote upon the majority of their sex by these few noisy, unthinking women, a duty for which a woman is by temperament and character totally unsuited.

"Living in a State where these suffrage agitators have once and for all brought women to the street corners to electioneer for votes, to persuade women to register, to act as election clerks in the voting booths for all-night sojourns, the whole vulgarity of the wretched situation is before my eyes.

"The effects of suffrage here are often amusing, but in the main distressing. One woman assured me yesterday she had voted only because she did not like the way her husband had voted, and she wished to cancel the effect of his vote. He had voted for Mr. Wilson and she for Mr. Roosevelt. J. K. D.

"Berkeley, Cal., November 26, 1912."

QUESTION 150.—*In what ways and to what extent is a Theosophist justified in exercising his own powers of suggestion, thought, will, etc., with a view to leading to a purer course of life, one who has a growing tendency to the drink habit, a full knowledge of the evil consequences of the same, and a strong will which as yet is not exercised in this matter?*

ANSWER.—So far as my memory goes, the fullest discussion of this question from the Theosophical standpoint is that of Mme. Blavatsky, in an article in *Lucifer,* reprinted, I believe, as Number 2, of the *Studies in Occultism.* Mme. Blavatsky held that it is both right and desirable to use hypnotism to stop a drunkard on the downward path, thus preventing further degradation, and giving the soul a better opportunity to overcome the evil tendency in a future life. But to do this, the will must be both strong and pure. In reality, it is a question of exorcism, always a dangerous thing to attempt, until one is far along the path of spiritual development. C. J.

ANSWER.—A Theosophist is wholly justified in exercising all his powers *wisely* to help another to overcome an evil habit. Wise assistance could be given only by arousing to action the dormant will of the person in question, not by coercion or control of the will by another. Such help may be rendered by co-operating—through the means of ardent prayer—with the Oversoul. If the submission of the personal will to the Divine will be absolute, an unobstructed channel is thereby made through the personal powers, along which the Divine current may flow. All souls being one with the Oversoul, that current will reach the person to be helped, restoring to its normal functions, through the strengthened will, the perverted natural instinct. S. W. A.

ANSWER.—Has the would-be theosophist, the would-be disciple, any powers that he could call "his own"? If he is merely steward of all the power and the force that he has, then surely he must look deep into the life and the needs of another before he would venture an attempt to rearrange the ongoing of that other's life. Most of us have great difficulty in eradicating the notion that to prevent some overt act is great gain. How frequently the wisest parents find themselves rejoicing with their child over the fact that he was not "caught" by the teacher in some infraction of rules, or in some failure to master a lesson! Yet to be discovered in his fault brings the opportunity to learn better. Frequently the drunkard is the "discovered" soul; his lapses are evident. Should we really do anything for him if we could cover them up? Suppose that "by suggestion" the desire to drink is turned into some other channel, perhaps an underground channel. Friends rejoice in a "cure," the home is happier and life looks brighter, but has anything really happened? A wise physician does not treat the symptoms, he treats the disease. Unless the person who wishes to help this sufferer has himself reached the point in development where he can divine the real and inner cause of this outer weakness, I do not see how he can help the other directly; nor that he has the right to try either "suggestion, thought, or will" on him. But there remain love and courage; and no powers from the outside can be more effective in helping one who knows the result of his course of action, but does not know how to harness his will to the task before him. P.

ANSWER.—I remember that Mr. Judge always discouraged using anything like "suggestion" for the help of others, as a cure for physical ills. Disease and pain, he said (and I suppose dipsomania should be counted as a disease), were affections belonging to the physical plane and any attempt to relieve them by forces belong-

ing to higher planes, resulted only in dragging down those forces, and degradir them by putting them to work that did not belong to them. I should suppose th the right way would be to strengthen the will apart from the drink habit, to devo the thoughts to the highest subjects that the sufferer is capable of dwelling up and above all to keep the body in as perfect a condition as possible. The r work should be on the physical plane, and not on the astral when it is a quest of subduing perverted tendencies and abnormal desires which belong to t physical body and have their origin there. K. H

QUESTION 151.—*There are many adherents to all the great religions who ho that help can and should be rendered to the dead. What does Theosophy tear regarding this?*

ANSWER.—It is always a hazardous thing for any one to undertake to say tha "Theosophy" teaches this or that, since no mortal is qualified to speak for Theos ophy, the Divine Wisdom of the Logos. But many students of Theosophy believ that the prayers, even of those who know little, can and do help the "dead," just as they help the living; the mere non-possession of a body does not withdraw one from the influence of the fine spiritual force called forth and directed by pure prayer. But the prayer must be both pure and disinterested, otherwise it may perturb and disturb the excarnate soul. Hence, probably, arose the custom of asking the priests to pray for the dead, since it was held that their prayers were pure, and were certain to be free from the personal coloring that might cause harm. Some Theosophists go much further, and believe that the "dead," meaning by this, souls in Devachan and in the preliminary states leading thereto, are under the guardianship of certain classes of Masters, who most certainly do "render help to the dead," just as their illustrious colleagues of another class render help to the living. C. J.

ANSWER.—What does the questioner mean by "help rendered to the dead"? If the personality is intended, that, we are told, perishes with the physical body, which only remains a very short time in "the place of departed spirits," as many Catholics hold. They believe that prayers said for the departed have a direct influence upon them, and help them to rise to higher spheres, and mitigate the pains of purgatory. But we know that each man must work out his own salvation, must build for himself his own heaven and his own hell; nor is it possible for any one of the living to lift one stone from the walls that close him in.

But as the higher can reach down to the lower, those who have passed away can help those who are still in life, by the force of their love and constant thought. In the *Key to Theosophy,* page 150, H. P. B. says: "We say that love beyond the grave has a magic and divine potency which reacts on the living. . . . For love is a strong shield, and is not limited by space or time." K. H.

ANSWER.—We have been taught that death causes no change in the inner man. If we are able to help and should help our dear ones still clothed in flesh, shall we be justified in neglecting them, once they have laid aside this outer garment, they being still unchanged? We can and should help the dead, by praying for their growth and advancement. S. W. A.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

ABRIDGMENT OF THE SECRET DOCTRINE, (Hillard)	$2.16
A PRIMER OF THEOSOPHY, by Katherine Hillard	.10
BHAGAVAD GITA, translated by Charles Johnston	1.00
BHAGAVAD GITA, Edited by W. Q. Judge, leather	.75
CABINET SIZE PHOTO, H. P. BLAVATSKY or W. Q. JUDGE	.50
CULTURE OF CONCENTRATION, by W. Q. Judge, paper	.10
DREAM OF RAVAN, cloth	1.00
ESOTERIC BUDDHISM, by A. P. Sinnett, cloth	1.25
FIVE YEARS OF THEOSOPHY	3.25
FRAGMENTS, by Cavé	.60
IDYLL OF THE WHITE LOTUS, cloth	1.00
KARMA: WORKS AND WISDOM, by Charles Johnston	.35
KARMA, by A. P. Sinnett, a novel, cloth	.75
KEY TO THEOSOPHY, by H. P. Blavatsky	2.00
LETTERS THAT HAVE HELPED ME, by W. Q. Judge	
Vol. I, compiled by Jasper Niemand, cloth	.50
Vol. II, compiled by Thomas Green and Jasper Niemand, cloth	.50
LIGHT OF ASIA, by Sir Edwin Arnold, cloth, 75c.; leather	1.00
LIGHT ON THE PATH, cloth, 50c.; leather	.75
MAGIC, WHITE AND BLACK, by Franz Hartmann, M.D., cloth	2.00
MEDITATION, by Henry Bedinger Mitchell	.20
NIGHT-MARE TALES, by H. P. Blavatsky, cloth	.50
OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY, by W. Q. Judge, paper, 50c.; cloth	.75
OCCULT WORLD, by A. P. Sinnett, cloth	1.25
PATANJALI'S YOGA SUTRAS, translated by Charles Johnston	1.10
REINCARNATION, by E. D. Walker, cloth	1.50
REINCARNATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, by Jas. M. Pryse, paper, 35c.; cloth	.60
SECRET DOCTRINE, by H. P. Blavatsky, Vols. I and II, and Index, cloth	12.50
SERMON ON THE MOUNT, translated by Jas. M. Pryse, paper, 35c.; cloth	.60
SOME MODERN FAILINGS, Che-Yew-Tsang	.10
TALKS ON RELIGION, by H. B. Mitchell	1.50
THEOSOPHY AS AN INFLUENCE IN LIFE, by Archibald Keightley	.10
THEOSOPHICAL BADGES, gold, 2.50; rolled gold	1.00
THE APOCALYPSE UNSEALED, by James M. Pryse	2.00
THE CREED OF BUDDHA	1.50
THE CREED OF CHRIST	1.25
THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM, by Charles Johnston	.20
THE SONG OF LIFE, by Charles Johnston, cloth	.30
THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THEOSOPHY, by H. B. Mitchell	.20
THE THEOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS, by Charles Johnston	1.25
THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD, cloth	.50
UNITY OF RELIGIONS, by J. W. Keightley	.10
VOICE OF THE SILENCE, by H. P. Blavatsky, cloth, 50c.; leather	.75
VOW OF POVERTY AND OTHER ESSAYS, by Jasper Niemand, paper.	.15

These and any other books on Theosophical, Religious and Philosophical subjects, can be obtained from

THE SECRETARY T. S.,

159 Warren Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Theosophical Society

Founded by H. P. Blavatsky at New York in 1875

THE Society does not pretend to be able to establish at once a universal brotherhood among men, but only strives to create the nucleus of such a body. Many of its members believe that an acquaintance with the world's religions and philosophies will reveal, as the common and fundamental principle underlying these, that "spiritual identity of all Souls with the Oversoul" which is the basis of true brotherhood; and many of them also believe that an appreciation of the finer forces of nature and man will still further emphasize the same idea.

The organization is wholly unsectarian, with no creed, dogma, nor personal authority to enforce or impose; neither is it to be held responsible for the opinions of its members, who are expected to accord to the beliefs of others that tolerance which they desire for their own.

The following proclamation was adopted at the Convention of the Society, held at Boston, April, 1895:

"The Theosophical Society in America by its delegates and members in Convention assembled, does hereby proclaim fraternal good will and kindly feeling toward all students of Theosophy and members of Theosophical Societies wherever and however situated. It further proclaims and avers its hearty sympathy and association with such persons and organizations in all theosophical matters except those of government and administration, and invites their correspondence and co-operation.

"To all men and women of whatever caste, creed, race, or religious belief, who aim at the fostering of peace, gentleness, and unselfish regard one for another, and the acquisition of such knowledge of men and nature as shall tend to the elevation and advancement of the human race, it sends most friendly greeting and freely proffers its services.

"It joins hands with all religions and religious bodies whose efforts are directed to the purification of men's thoughts and the bettering of their ways, and it avows its harmony therewith. To all scientific societies and individual searchers after wisdom upon whatever plane, and by whatever righteous means pursued, it is and will be grateful for such discovery and unfoldment of Truth as shall serve to announce and confirm a *scientific basis for ethics.*

"And lastly, it invites to its membership those who, seeking a higher life hereafter, would learn to know the *path* to tread in this."

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Secretary T. S., 159 Warren Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

BROOKLYN EAGLE PRESS.